4 - 3

Thomas F. Torrance

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

http://www.archive.org/details/defenceofchur00ande

A

DEFENCE

OF THE

CHURCH-GOVERNMENT, FAITH, WORSHIP & SPIRIT

OF THE

Presbyterians.

In ANSWER to a late Book Intituled, An APOLOGY for Mr. *THOMAS RHIND.* Or an Account of the *Manner* how, and the *Reasons* for which he Separated from the *Presbyterian* Party, and embraced the Communion of the *CHURCH.*

By *JOHN ANDERSON* M. A. Minister of the Gospel in *DUMBARTON.*

1 John II. 19. *They went out from us, but they were not of us:* ----------

GLASGOW,
Printed by *HUGH BROWN.* M. DCC. XIV.

TO

The Right Honourable

ARCHIBALD,

EARL of *ILAY*,

LORD-JUSTICE-GENERAL,
of the Kingdom of *Scotland*,

One of the Extraordinary Lords

OF

SESSION,

AND

Governour of *Dumbarton*-Caſtle.

My Lord,

Have, upon moe Accounts than one Preſum'd to Shelter this Book under *Your* Patronage.

THE

DEDICATION.

THE Great Family, whence You are Sprung, and whereof You are ſo Bright an Ornament, has always, ſince the firſt Dawn of the *Reformation*, Patroniz'd the Cauſe therein Defended. They have Manag'd it by their *Wiſdom*, Protected it with Their *Sword*, Adorn'd it by Their *Lives*, and too often Sealed it with Their *Blood*. Yet even this was a Fate rather to be Envied than Lamented. For, to fall a Sacrifice at once for Their GOD and Their Country; To be tranſmitted to Poſterity under the united Characters of *MARTYR* and *PATRIOT*; This, *MY LORD*, was, next to the Enjoyment of Heaven, the higheſt Glory Great and Virtuous Souls cou'd attain to.

I need not tell *Your Lordſhip* that the ſame Cauſe is ſtill in Hazard. It is Lampoon'd in the *Tavern*, Declaim'd againſt from the *Pulpit*, Scribbl'd at from the *Preſs*, and its Ruin Projected by the Dealers in the *Politicks*. Yet all the Nation is Perſuaded, that it is no leſs the Inclination,

tion, than 'tis visibly the Interest of the Family of ARGYLE heartily to espouse it: And all the Owners of that Interest, that is, the Wiser and Better and far Greater Part of the Nation, have necessarly such an Opinion of the Personal sufficiency of the Principal Members of that House, as to found the greatest Expectations thereon.

YOUR Illustrious Brother, The DUKE, has rais'd Himself to an Unrival'd Glory, and Distinguish'd Himself as the *HERO* of the Age.

YOU, *My Lord*, not contented to excell in those Exercises, which are too often the only Accomplishment of Persons distinguish'd by Their Birth, not satisfied to have Adorn'd Your Mind with that which is call'd the *Polite* Part of Learning; and, by a True Taste of the *Belles Lettres*, and uncommon Advances in the *Mathematicks* and all the most valuable Parts of Philosophy, to make Your Conversation both Shining and Instructive. Not satisfied, I say,

with all this, You have beſides, that you might be a Publick Good to your Country, ſtock'd Your Soul with ſo Exact and Extenſive a Knowledge of the *Laws*, that you are Diſtinguiſh'd on the Bench by your *Ability* no leſs than by Your *Quality:* And the whole *Nation* finds it ſelf Happy in Her *Majeſty*'s Wiſe Choice of *Your Lordſhip* to bear ſo great a Part in thoſe *Courts*, on the Sentences of which their *Lives* and *Fortunes* depend.

THO' then, *My Lord*, the Weakneſſes of the Book are *Mine* only, and ſo can no Way affect *Your Lordſhip*; yet the *Subject* of it, and the *Cauſe* it appears for, neceſſarly intitle it to the Patronage of a Perſon of your Character. You, *My Lord*, know that the *Presbyterian* Eſtabliſhment in *Scotland* can never be overthrown; without breaking through whatever has been hitherto held *Sacred* among Men. And *Your Lordſhip* knows, there is no Cauſe why it ſhou'd be attempted.

THO'

THO' the *High-Church* Faction, with whom *Modesty* and *Moderation* are reckon'd Scandal, has taught her *Proselyts* to Charge the *Presbyterians* with a *SPIRIT Diametrically Opposite to that of the Gospel*; Yet, You, *My Lord*, from Your oun Personal Acquaintance with 'em, know, how False and Calumnious that Charge is. As 'tis Evident, to the Observation of all the World, that They are the most serious Christians; So *Your Lordship* is abundantly convinced, that They are the most Faithfull Subjects Her *Majesty* has on this Side the *Border*.

THEY don't indeed allow of a *WORSHIP* Fring'd with *Ceremonies* of Human Invention and Imposition. But, I'm persuaded, a Person of *Your Lordship's* Reflection must needs be sensible, that a Minister of GOD never makes a more Unsightly Figure, than when Appearing in a Party-Colour'd Dress, and Practising Motions and Postures His Heavenly Master never enjoin'd Him. 'Tis True the *Presbyterians*

terians don't restrict themselves to *Forms* in Praying to Almighty GOD: But, I suppose, *Your Lordship* does not think a Begger ever the less Sincere, tho' he don't always ask his Alms in the same studied *Cant.*

'TIS Confess'd likewise, there are several *ARTICLES OF FAITH* taught by the *Presbyterians*, which are above the Comprehension of Our finite Minds: But *Your Lordship*, who, every Day, in the Search of *Nature*, find so many *Appearances* perfectly Unaccountable from the Laws of *Mechanism*, without having Recourse to the First Mover and great Author of Nature, can't be surpriz'd to find *Articles in Religion* not otherwise to be Resolv'd, but by Believing That *GOD's Judgments are Unsearchable and His Ways past finding out.* Nor will *Your Lordship*, I presume, be straitned to Believe, that the whole *Christian* Church, which has Taught those Articles equally with the *Presbyterians*, is as likely to be in the Right, as an Upstart

Upſtart Sect of yeſterday, whoſe *Confidence* is their moſt Uſefull Quality.

IN a Word, *My Lord*, the *Presbyterians* diſown a *PRELACY* among the Miniſters of the Goſpel: And, on this Score, *High-Church* finds in Her Heart to Damn 'em by the Lump, and Mercifully to conſign 'em to Everlaſting Flames. But *Your Lordſhip* has a juſter Notion of the Kind Author of our Being, than to Believe that He will Ruine His Creatures for not Submitting to a *Government*, which its Freſheſt and moſt Learn'd Patrons own, is not to be found in the *ORACLES OF TRUTH.*

I have therefore adventur'd to Inſcribe this Piece to *Your Lordſhip*; not doubting but, how Weak ſoever the *Performance* may be, that yet an *Eſſay* to Defend ſo very Good a Cauſe, wherein not only *Truth*, but *Peace*, *Charity* and *Good Neighbourhood* are ſo much concern'd, will not be quite Ungratefull to You.

DEDICATION.

THAT *Your Lordſhip* may be always Bleſſed with the Richeſt Favours of Heaven, is, and ſhall be the Daily Prayer of

MY LORD,

Your Lordſhip's

moſt Humble, and

moſt Obedient Servant

JOHN ANDERSON.

THE PREFACE.

BEING *Sensible that Books always occasion an Expence of Money, and, which is much more valuable, of Time; I think my self obliged to account, why I have given the Publick the Trouble of this.*

HOW soon the APOLOGY *appeared; that Party, which is distinguish'd by the Name of* HIGH-CHURCH, *Gloried both in the* Author *and in the Service He had done. They Spread His Book with great Industry into the several Parts of the* Nation, *Recommended it as a* Perfect Piece *in its Kind, and at length Boasted it made* Proselyts.

I hate to Grudge even an Adversary *His due Praise. I frankly own, Mr.* Rhind *has done as well as the Subject was Capable of. I own, His Book is, of its Bulk, the most Comprehensive in its Subject, I have seen. Some* Authors *have attaqued Us upon the Head of* GOVERNMENT, *some upon our* DOCTRINE, *some upon our* WORSHIP, *and some too (tho' these not always excessively Qualified, either Morally or Intellectually, for such an Undertaking) upon our* SPIRIT *and* PRACTICE. *But Mr.* Rhind *has wid'ned the Compass, and taken all Four within His Circle, hinting at every Thing, of a General Nature, that has been wont to be objected to us; and all this in so very* Pointed *a Stile, that, had His* Probation *been equal, there had been an End of the matter, and the World had heard its last of* Presbytry *for ever.*

IT

IT might then possibly have argued, either too much Indolence, or an Ill Conscience, to have neglected such a Book, without either Answering or Confessing to it. Nor is it quite Improbable that Silence wou'd have heightned the Vanity of a Party *abundantly remarkable already for that Quality. I cannot deny but these Considerations somewhat Influenced me to write.*

BUT then, That which Determin'd *me, was the Consideration of the* Design *of Mr.* Rhind's *Book, and of the* Effect *it must necessarly have, so far as it Persuades. And who knows how far it may do so? Mankind grows Daily more Corrupt; and Mr.* Rhind *is very far from being singular in what He has advanced, most Part of Books we get from* High-Church *being of the same* Strain, *and Breathing the very same* Spirit.

NOW what else is the Design *of Mr.* Rhind's *Book, but to overturn the most Sacred and Important Truths? And what else can the* Effect *of it be, so far as it obtains Credit, but the Utmost Contempt of Seriousness and Piety; which,* GOD *knows, is at too low an Ebb already on both sides? What else is the* Design *of it, but to Exasperate the one Half of the* Nation *into Rage and Fury against the other? And, shou'd it gain Faith, how Dire must the* Consequences *be? Then must* Love, Peace, *and* Charity *be for ever Banish'd, a State of Universal Hostility instantly commence,* Persecution, *in all its most terrible Forms, take Place, till not only* Presbytry *be abolish'd, but the whole Generation of* Presbyterians *be Extirpated from off the Face of the Earth, which, I suppose will hardly ever be, so long as there is a* Bible *on it.*

THAT Unhappy Fellow De Foe, *some Ten or Twelve Years ago, put all* England *in a Ferment by His* SHORTEST WAY WITH THE DISSENTERS. *But what else is His* Shortest Way, *but the Immediate Use of the Doctrine laid down in Mr.* Rhind's *Book, and indeed generally in all the Controversial Books, and oftimes in the Sermons, of* High-Church? *For*

IF

IF the Presbyterian *Pastors are no* Ministers; *If their* Sacraments *are null; If all, who are of that Communion,* are out of the Ordinary Road to Heaven, *and can have no Rational Hope of Salvation; Does it not unavoidably follow that it is the Duty of Our Civil Governours to overturn their Settlement? Is it not plain that They are in a State of Deadly Sin so long as They leave it undone? Were it not an ACT of Great Mercy, and Christian Compassion to* COMPELL us to come in, *tho' it were by the Rough Arguments of* Heading, Hanging *and such like, rather than suffer us to go into Hell Fire Our selves, and lead others thither, with the Limbs intire? If* Presbyterians *are not only* without the Church, *but* Enemies *to it, what can the* STATE *in Conscience do, but Declare them to be denuded of all those Immunities and Priviledges which the Law had secur'd 'em in, and which hitherto They have enjoyed in Common with Their Neighbours, upon the Presumption of Their being* Christians? *If* Presbyterian Parity *is so Inconsistent in its oun Nature with* Monarchy, *are not the Civil Powers obliged for Their own Security* to crush a Society of so Dangerous a Constitution? *If the* Presbyterian Spirit is *Diametrically Opposite to that of the Gospel, what Eternal Animosities must there be 'twixt* True Church *and such a Party? Is it possible but that, upon such a Supposition, there must be Constant and Mortal Feuds in every the same City, the same Congregation, the same Family, and oftimes in the same Bed? For, what shou'd an* Episcopal *Husband, who wou'd not pass for Henpeck'd* *, *do with a Wife who is Incorrigibly* Presbyterian? *Shall He still cherish the Serpent in His Bosom till She sting him to Death? Shall he hug the Charming Tempter till she Teaze him into the Devouring Jaws of the Old Serpent by Her Bewitching Importunites? Must not then all Things run into Confusion upon such Principles? 'Tis True, Almighty Providence may restrain such Dismal Effects, or Good Nature may overcome bad Principles; but such, I'm sure, are the Native Consequences of e'm, and are Daily put in Practice in all the Popish Countries; too sure a Sign (besides the Proof of former Experience) that not Will, but Power only, is wanting to act the same Tragical*

† † *Scenes*

* See the *Apology* p. 205. &c.

Scenes in Britain. *And what leſs ſhou'd be expected from a Party, which juſtifies all that* Carnage *the* French *King has made of His* Proteſtant *Subjects* †?

THIS then being the Natural Product of the Principles of Mr. Rhind's *Book, I thought I owed this Service not only to the Truth but to My Country; And that I was obliged to bring my Bucket, tho' a ſhallow one, to Quench that Flame which, if not ſuppreſs'd in Time, muſt needs Conſume it to Aſhes, and bring us to the ſame miſerable State which,* Joſephus *tells us, the* Zealots *brought* Jeruſalem *into before its Deſtruction. This, I hope, will not only excuſe but Juſtify my Writing.*

BUT then the next Queſtion will be, Why ſo largely? Was it ſo very hard a Matter to Anſwer Mr. Rhind, *that no leſs than a Book about Four Times the Bigneſs of His cou'd ſerve the Turn? His Singularities are but few, and might have been quickly diſcuſſed; nor had the Reader been at any Great Loſs, tho' they had been quite neglected. What elſe He has advanced has been brought into the Field a Hundred Times before, and it might have been Sufficient for Anſwer to have recommended the Reader to former Writers on the ſame Subjects. Beſides, He has very often through His Book, and upon the* Spirit of the Presbyterians *always, contented Himſelf with meer Aſſertion: And, in ſuch Caſes, 'tis ſtill as Honourable to deny without a Reaſon, as it was to aſſert without a Proof.*

ALL this I acknowledge is very True; and ſuch a Conduct, 'tis plain, had brought my Book within a very Moderate Compaſs: But then too, ſuch a Conduct had ſunk its Uſefullneſs proportionally with its Bulk: For I did Intend by it, and ſhall be ſorry if the Reader find himſelf diſappointed, ſomewhat more than a Simple Confutation of the Apology: *I deſign'd it ſhou'd be of Univerſal Uſe in this Controverſy; and therefore have not barely* Deny'd, *which in very many Caſes*

† See afterward p. 69.

Cases had been enough for our Apologist, *and wou'd have very much shortned the Work; but I have* Disproved *too: Nor have I put off the Reader with Answering Mr.* Rhind, *but have said as much as I thought Sufficient to Satisfie the Argument it self by whoever it were manag'd.*

PLAINLY I design'd, In the First *Place, to say as much as was needfull to Vindicate the* Presbyterians *from those Imputations in Fact which fill so many Hundreds of the* Episcopal *Sermons, Books and Pamphlets, and are so much the Subject of their Conversation. If in doing this I have mention'd any Facts on their Side, the hearing whereof may be Grateing to them, they have themselves to blame: For every one must own, it was a very proper Way in Me, for Disproving the Reasons of Mr.* Rhind's *Conduct, to make it appear, that the Side He had espoused lay every Way as open to Exceptions as that He had Deserted. Here then the Old Apology takes Place*

----Sciat
Responsum, non Dictum esse, quia læsit prius.

But then, which will sufficiently distinguish my Managment, the Reader may Promise Himself to find My Assertions verified, in all Cases needfull, by the most Authentick and Unexceptionable Documents, a Piece of Drudgery which Mr. Rhind *has, and the Writers of His Party generally do, excuse themselves from.* 2dly, *I design'd to say as much as I thought needfull for Convincing any Man's Conscience that the* Presbyterian *Communion is not only Safe but the Best, both as to Government, Faith and Worship. And as the Reader will find all the Arguments for* Prelacy *particularly Discourst; so, which I doubt not will be surprizing enough, He will find my Reasonings against 'em Fortified by the Judgment even of the most eminent Divines of the Church of* England *who habitually reject each others Arguments for* Prelacy, *and are so very unhappily situated, that they can't possibly Defend against* Popery *but upon* Presbyterian *Principles, nor Impugn* Presbytry *but upon* Popish *ones. I hope then the Reader will easily Pardon me that*

I have run out into ſuch a Length when my Subject and Deſign was ſo large.

AS for that which is called STILE, *I have taken juſt as much care about it as was needfull to make my Self underſtood. Any further Niceneſs I judged Superfluous upon a Subject of this Nature, which I ſuſpect is not very capable of Dreſs, unleſs one intend a Harangue inſtead of a Diſpute.*

Ornare Res ipſa negat, contenta Doceri.

My greateſt care, next to that of the Matter, was that I ſhou'd not be Intricate or Perplexed, as Controverſies are apt to be: And this I hope I have obtain'd: For I have never made any Blind References to Mr. Rhind's *Book, but have always given His Senſe, and almoſt always in His oun Words, which is another conſiderable cauſe that my Book is ſo large.*

TO both which I may add a Third *viz. That I have inſerted ſome few Digreſſions, tho' not I hope from the Purpoſe, yet from the Thread of Mr.* Rhind's *Book. That upon the late* Vindication of the Fundamental Charter of Presbytry, *which the Reader will find p.* 32, *is but ſhort: And, tho' one wou'd think that* Scots *Men ought to be very little concern'd with the* Engliſh *Liturgy, yet that being the Diſpute of the Day, I underſtand that the Author of the* Country-Man's Letter to the Curate, *againſt which that* Vindication *is directed, intends, if GOD ſpare Him, a Second Edition, in one Volume on a fine Paper and Type, both of the* Dialogues concerning the Engliſh Liturgy, *and of that* Letter *&c; wherein the Subject of the* Liturgy *is to be more largely Diſcourſed, and whatever has been advanced againſt the* Dialogues *by Mr.* Barclay *or others, and againſt the* Letter *by the* Vindicator, *either in Reaſon or Hiſtory, is to be conſider'd. The largeſt Digreſſion I have made, which the Reader will find p.* 317. *is that on the Earl of* Cromerty's *late Book. Beſides that it was neceſſary in Point of Self Defence, I perſuade my Self His Lordſhip will be pleaſed with it, becauſe*

it

it may help to Exactneſs in a Piece of Hiſtory, which His Lordſhip has ſo much contributed to the Inlightning of.

AS to the Conduct of the whole Book, I am ſenſible how much I ſhall want the Reader's Indulgence. But this Piece of Juſtice I crave That He wou'd not Cenſure any one Part of it, till He have read through the whole; becauſe what He might perhaps expect to find in one Place, I may have poſſibly thought fit to reſerve to Another, where I fancied it might ſtand to greater Purpoſe or with a better Grace. Further, I muſt advertiſe the Reader, that, having uſed the Word WHIG *in ſome few Places, I meant it in the Original* Scotch *Senſe, as ſignifying a* Presbyterian, *except when by the Context it appears, that it is to be underſtood in that more Comprehenſive Notion Uſe has now affix'd to it.*

I hope the Reader will be Mercifull as to the Errors in Printing. Such as are of any Moment are but few; and both theſe and the leſſer Eſcapes in Spelling, Pointing, or Dividing of Syllables I expect will be Excuſed upon the Account of My Diſtance and neceſſary Abſence from the Preſs.

AFTER all I have ſaid p. 15. *there are ſome wou'd ſtill perſuade me that not Mr.* Rhind, *but another Perſon of a much higher Character is the true Author of the* APOLOGY. *But 'tis the ſame Thing to me whether it be ſo or otherwiſe: For I never thought that External Character cou'd either heighten or diminiſh the Intrinſick Value of a Book: Nor did I intend a Diſpute againſt any Man's Perſon, but, tho' I ordinarly name Mr.* Rhind *only, yet I generally mean His Party: And therefore, tho' He complains that the* Presbyterians have exhauſted all their Common Places of Slander againſt Him, *yet for my own Part, I have conſider'd Him meerly as the Writer of the* APOLOGY, *without ſo much as touching upon His Perſonal Qualities or Circumſtances in any Private Concern. I knew the Publick cou'd have been very little Edifyed with Perſonal*

Objections; and I did not think I wanted such Adminicles, the Argument it self having given me sufficient Advantage.

PLAINLY, I persuade my self that every one who has read Mr. Rhind's *Book will, upon the Reading of mine, allow that I have kept more Temper than perhaps was due to such a Piece. For, when a Set of People, about whom there is nothing* Extraordinarly *Christian appearing, will needs put such a Jest upon Mankind, as to Monopolize the Name of* CHURCH *to themselves, and Belch out their Fire and Venom, without Fear or Wit, against the whole Reformed Interest, and yet at the same Time will have us to believe 'em* Protestants; *In such a Case I must needs own, that*

Difficile est Satyram non Scribere,----

However, I have restrain'd my self as much as the Matter cou'd admit of, or either Justice or Charity required.

I reckon upon it that my Book will be answered; and 'tis hardly possible to foresee what kind of Arguments may be used against me; But there is one which I deprecate viz. *that Powerfull one* --- Damn me. *I don't fear that any of their* Laity *will attack me with it, I have a better Opinion of their Piety and Manners; but I dare not promise so much on their Clergy's Head: For,* what has been, † may be. *However, by Way of Prevention, I own it to be an unanswerable Kind of Argument; And therefore they may save themselves the Trouble of it; so much the rather that they cannot be very great Lovers, tho' they omit it.*

BUT I am sensible that by the Length of this Preface *I add to the Transgression of the* Book. *After all I can say, I know it must, as all other Books have ever done, take its Fate according to the*

[†] See, Mr Calder's Miscellany Numbers Num. IV.

the Inclination or Capacity of its Different Readers. And therefore, as it is, I send it forth into the World with its Father's Blessing, heartily praying that the GOD of Truth and Peace may Prosper It to the Preserving among us Two such valuable Enjoyments.

March 17th,
1714.

ERRATA.

PAge 9. Line 13. Read *that* flat. Ib. L. 15. r. I *have* heard. P. 13. L. 1. r. be *so* very. Ib. L. 13. r. crudely. Ib. L. 19 are *one* r. are *on*, and so in some other Places. P. 33. L. 21. r. Retractations. P. 42. L. 20. r. Loser. P. 43. L. 22 *Presbytries* r. Presbyters. P. 44. L. 8. *two* r. too. P. 45. L. 14. *Principal.* r. Principle. P. 48. L. 6. from the Form the Rules. r. from the Rules. Ib. L. 27. *is* examined. r. *are* examined. P. 64. L. 22. *Priest* r. *Priests.* P. 70. L. 20. r. revile. P. 71. L. 27. r. Necks. P. 72. L. 11. r. Eutropius. P. 76. L. 22. *his* Concession r. *this* Concession. P. 81. L. 31. Acts 10. r. Acts. 19. P. 86. L. 14. *hear* r. here. P. 112. the Word *Seven* in the End of the 2d Line is to be blotted out. P. 117. L. 28. *Martial.* r. Marital. P. 118. L. 1. *He* had. dele He. P. 120. L. 10. *Degrees.* r. Degree. P 143. L. 20. reterrs His Readers *to.* dele. *to.* P. 149. L. 8. His Words. r. His Words *are.* P. 175. L. 10. *on* Day. r. *one* Day. P. 176. L. 13. furnishing out *of* dele. *of* Ib. L. 23. Year 1642. r 1542. P 188 L 16 *Redicula* r. Ridicula. P 287. L. 8 is Nothing. dele the Point P. 319 L last Worse r Worst

CORRIGENDA IN MARGINE

PAge 71. a Capite. *Dele,* a. P. 85. *lege* Secessum. P. 97. *Lege* Vacabant. Ib. Legislativam. P. 98. *lege,* tribuendam. P. 100. *lege* quoque. P. 102. *Lege,* Terris. P. 133. *Lege,* Elegit. P. 148. *Lege* tradidisse. P. 164. *Lege,* forte. P. 175. *Lege,* peperit. P. 182. *lge,* Obsoleverit. P. 201. *Lege,* non accidunt.

Mr. *Rhind*'s Apology disproved.

THE INTRODUCTION.

THE general Method of Mr. *Rhind*'s Book is, I acknowledge, abundantly Distinct. Therein, after the History of the *MANNER* How, He gives an account of the *REASONS* for Which He separated from the *Presbyterian* Party; to wit, because, upon *Enquiry* He found Their *GOVERNMENT* to be Schismatical, Their *Articles* of *FAITH* fundamentally False and Pernicious, Their *WORSHIP* scandalously Corrupt and highly Imperfect, and their *SPIRIT* diametrically Opposite to that of the Gospel. A heavy enough Charge truly; and if but one half of it hold True, every good Christian must needs at once Justify his *Separation*, and Congratulate his Escape.

But it is the Design of the following Sheets to *Examine* his Performance; and if in the Issue it shall be found, that there is neither *Truth* in his *Assertions*, *Strength* in his *Arguments*, *Proof* for his *Alledgances*, nor *Modesty in his Characters*; Then, I hope, it will follow, that, how much Reason soever some other Party may have to be fond of their new Proselyt, yet the *Presbyterians* have no such Cause to be swallowed up of overmuch Sorrow for their Loss, but that they may hope the Days of their Mourning may wear over, and they may be comforted.

CHAP. I.

Containing preliminary Remarks.

THough his *Title*, *Preface* and *Narrative* have no great Influence on the main Subject; yet, that I may proceed in order; for clearing the Ground, I ſhall beg leave to take them under Review in ſome few *Remarks*: the rather, becauſe the doing ſo will, I hope, ſufficiently diſtinguiſh the Spirit of the *Author*, perhaps too, help to enlighten his Book.

SECT. I.

Containing Remarks on the Title *of Mr.* Rhind's *Book.*

1. MR. *Rhind* has given his Book the *Title* of an *Apology*. But, I apprehend, when the Book it ſelf is lookt into, it will appear to be very ill Choſen. The Apoſtle *Peter* enjoins (*a*) Chriſtians *to be always ready to make an* Apology (ſo it is from the Original) *to every one that asks a Reaſon of the Hope that is in them.* But, though that Apoſtle had as much Edge on His Temper, and poſſibly was as forward in his Zeal as Mr. *Rhind*; though the Cauſe of *Chriſtianity* was at leaſt of as great Importance as that of *Prelacy*, and the Enemies the Church had *then* to do with litle better natured than the *Presbyterians*; yet He would not allow them, in putting in an *APOLOGY* even for *Chriſtianity* it ſelf, though againſt *Jews* and *Pagans*, to uſe Rudeneſs or Bitterneſs, far leſs Calumny and Slander; but expreſly Charges Them to do it with *MEEKNESS* and *FEAR*. Mr. *Rhind* was not Ignorant of this Precept, He has fronted his Book with it; but, ſince ever *Apologies* were in faſhion, I very much doubt if ever any was writ with ſo unchriſtian a Spirit, ſo abſolutly void of both theſe Requiſites. I do not believe the

(*a*) 1 Epiſt. Chap. 3. 15.

the Reader wou'd think himself much gratified by entertaining Him with a Collection of all the Passages in the *Apology* that might contribute to prove this Character I have given of it: Yet 'tis necessary I produce *One*, lest any should suspect I charge Him falsly. And *one*, I'm perswaded, will be fully sufficient for that Purpose. I shall therefore, without adding, altering or diminishing, transcribe one Paragraph from Him, wherein He has drawn the Character of the *Presbyterians*, distinguish'd too into its Periods for the Readers more distinct conception. It is thus

1 'They (*the Presbyterians*) are naturally Rigid and Severe, and 'therefore conclude, that God is such a one as themselves. 2. They 'damn all who differ from them, and therefore think that God 'does the same. 3. And because They love themselves, They are pleased to perswade Themselves that They are his special Favorites. 4. In a Word, They are Respecters of Persons, and therefore think to Patronize Their Partiality with His Authority. 5. Hence They conclude that They owe them no Civilities whom God neglects, nor kind Offices whom he hates. 6. He neglects and hates all who are not capable of his Grace, which none are (say they) who are not of their Way. 7. This wicked perswasion sanctifies not only the ill Manners, but which is worse, the ill Nature of the Party, towards all who differ from them. It contradicts the Ends of Society and Government, and is only calculated to advance the private Interest of a Partial and Designing Set of Men! Thus He p. 208.

Now, if in all this Paragraph there is the least allay of *Meekness*, He would very much oblige us, if He would tell us what *Bitterness* and *Malice* is.

But though His Zeal swallowed up his *MEEKNESS*, yet, was there no place for *FEAR* (the other Requisite) I mean a Reverence and Regard to Truth? Might he not have thought it Necessary to offer at least at some Instances for supporting the said Character? Did he fancy it would be believed on his bare Word? He must be abundantly sanguin if he did. However, *Presbyterians* don't think themselves much in hazard from Writers that sacrifice their Veracity to the Pleasure of breathing their Spleen. They are accustom'd to have the most black Characters drawn of them by the Rampant high Church Authors; But they don't feel themselves

much hurt thereby, becauſe they are as notoriouſly *falſe* as they are *Black*. 'Tis difficult to name that ill Thing which a *Heylin*, a *Hicks*, a *Leſsly*, a *Sacheverel*, *Calder* or ſome other very Reverend Divine of the like Probity has not write of Them or imputed to Them. Who were the Inſtruments that procured the *Spaniſh* Armado to invade *England* in 1588? The Whigs (*b*). Who burnt *London* in 1666? The Whigs (*c*). Who piloted in and aſſiſted the *Dutch* to burn the *Engliſh* Fleet at *Chatham*? The Whigs (*d*). Nay who crucified Jeſus Chriſt? Who but the Whigs, the very Children are taught to liſp out that (*e*). *Calves Headfeaſts* are with theſe Authors true Hiſtory, Why? Becauſe one of themſelves wrote it, and the reſt cite it (*f*), and who dares doubt it after that?

But ſuppoſe it was below an Author of Mr. *Rhind*'s Soaring *Genius* to adduce *Proof* for his Aſſertions, or to regard ſo ſmall a Circumſtance as *Truth* in his Characters; yet might he not have uſed ſo much common Prudence, as not to draw the *Presbyterians* in the Habit of High-Church *Tories*, and to Twit them with that whereof Himſelf and Fellows are notoriouſly Guilty beyond what was ever heard of among any Party of Chriſtians except the Church of *Rome*? His forecited Character turns mainly upon *uncharitableneſs*. *The Presbyterians*, ſaith he, *damn all that differ from them, and therefore think that God does the ſame*. But is not this even the *diſtinguiſhing* Principle of a *High-flyer*? Has not Mr. *Dodwell*, whom Mr. *Rhind* ſo much admires, and upon whoſe Principles he profeſſes to have formed his own p. 24, 25. expreſly taught, that *there is no communicating with the* FATHER *or the* SON *but by Communion with the Biſhop*. 'It is, *ſaith he*, one of (*g*) 'the moſt dreadful aggravations of the Condition of the 'Damn'd, that they are baniſhed from the Preſence of the Lord and 'from the Glory of his Power. The ſame is their Condition alſo 'who are diſunited from Chriſt, by being diſunited from his vi'ſible Repreſentative (the Biſhop). Nay, has he not ſhut up even the ſmall Cranny of the *uncovenanted* Mercies of God, which might have let in ſome faint Ray of Hope, againſt all the

(*b*) *Caſſandra* Numb. II. p. 57. (*c*) New Aſſociation part II. p. 58. (*d*) *Ibid.* (*e*) *Calder* on the Sign of the Croſs, Numb. VIII. p. 32. (*f*) *Caſſandra* Numb. I. p. 46. [*g*] One Prieſthood, Chap. XIII. Sect. 14. 15.

the World but *Episcopalians* alone, by declaring in that same Place, 'That it is *extreamly* uncertain, and at least *infinitly* hazardous '(and what can be beyond *Infinite?*) that ever they shall share 'in them.' Do not Scores of their other Authors talk at the same Rate? But why do I speak of others? Is not this the very Design of Mr. *Rhind*'s Book? Was not that the Reason why he *Separated* from the Presbyterians, because *They are not in the Ordinary Road to Heaven* p. 31? Nay I hope to make it good to every Man's Conviction ere I have done, that he has damned the whole Christian Churches on Earth, the Church of *England* her self too among the Rest excepting some *High-flyers*, who can no more be said to be of the Church, than an overgrown Wen or some monstrous Tumour on the Body can be called a Part of it. Think now how well calculate Mr. *Rhind*'s Book is to bear the Title of an *Apology*; how wisely and justly his Meek and Catholick Spirit charges the *Presbyterians* with *Rigour* and *Uncharitableness*. I wou'd advise him, if ever his Book come to a *Second* Edition, to alter the *Title* a litle, and instead of an APOLOGY to call it a LYBELL.

II. In his *Title* he promises to give *an Account of the Reasons for which he separated from the Presbyterian Party*, AND EMBRACED THE COMMUNION OF THE CHURCH. I cannot but wish he had been a litle more particular, and told us OF WHAT CHURCH. 'Tis true, the Church is but one; yet there are several *Communions*. There is the *Roman*, the *Lutheran*, the Church of *England* Communion, with too many others, which differ from each other in very considerable Points; But though I have read his Book with all the Application I was Capable of; I sincerely declare I cannot find out that Church, whose *Communion* he can reasonably claim to.

The *Presbyterian Party* is that which he hath abandon'd. He hath, though indeed in very modest Terms, disclaimed the Communion of the Church of *Rome* p. 14. 15. The *Greek*, *Armenian*, *Ethiopick* Churches &c lay too far out of his Road. The lesser Fractions and Sects among Christians he gave not himself the Trouble to enquire about, from a just Fear lest if he had, *He had ended His Days, ere He had formed His Confession of Faith* p. 14. What Church then can it be whose Communion he has embraced?

He

He has given us *three* hints to find her out by, but none of them sufficient to give Light in the Matter and determine the Enquiry.

I. He tells us p. 28 *It is the Communion of the* Catholick *Church.* But this *CATHOLICK* is a Hackney which every Party presses into their Service, every Church claims, and the Church of *Rome*, which yet he disowns, appropriates to her Self. And so we are just as Wise as we were.

II. He tells us in the Beginning of his *Preface*, that it is the Communion of the *SUFFERING CHURCH*, by which he means the *Prelatists* in *Scotland*. But, though he hath joined himself to them, yet that he is not of them, nor within their Communion, I shall, ere I go further, make abundantly Evident upon this single *Postulatum*, that that CHURCH is the same in her *Principles* now she is *Suffering*, that She was while *Flourishing*.

She was while Flourishing *Erastian* in her *Government*, *Calvinist* in her *Doctrine*, her *Worship* without a *Liturgy*, her *Discipline* exercised by *Lay Elders*. All which is directly Contrary to the Principles of Mr. *Rhind*'s Book.

First, I say, His *Suffering* Church was *Erastian* in her *Government*. Besides the Tract of our History and many Acts of Parliament, Arch-Bishop *Gladstones* has given Emphatick Testimony that it was so in the Time of King *James* VI. In his Letter to that Prince of the Date *August* 31. 1612. He has these remarkable Words. 'For, 'besides that no Estate may say, that they are your Majesties Creatures, as we may; so there is none whose standing is so slippery, 'when your Majesty shall frown, as We. For at your Majesties 'Nod we must either stand or fall. Thus also it was in the late Times after the Restauration of King *Charles* II, as appears by the Act of Parliament Redintegrating the Estate of Bishops: For therein 'the Disposal of the External Government and Policy of the 'Church was declared to be in his Majesty and his Successors as an 'inherent Right of the Crown, and that they might settle, enact 'and limit such Constitutions, Acts and Orders concerning the 'Administration of the External Government of the Church, and 'the Persons employed in the same, and concerning all Ecclesiasti-'cal Meetings, and Matters to be proposed and determin'd there-

'in

'in, as they, in their Royal Wisdom, shall think fit. Did she alter this Principle upon the *Revolution*? No. In the Year 1692, no fewer than 180 of the *Episcopal* Clergy with Dr. *Canaries* on their Head, in their own Name and in that of the whole Body of the *Episcopal* Clergy in the *North*, addressed the General Assembly to be assumed into Ministerial Communion and a Share of the Church-Government upon a *Formula* whereof the First Words are. *I A. B.* 'do sincerely declare and promise, that I will submit to the *Presby-* 'terian Government of the Church as it is now established in this 'Kingdom---. This they could not, without exposing themselves to Damnation, have promised to do, had they judged *Presbyterian* Government to be *Schismatical*; But their Doing so was very well consistent with the *Erastian* Principles. Now Mr. *Rhinds* Principles are directly opposite to these: For he hath not only taught, 'That 'the Church is a Society independent upon the State, P. 29. but that *Prelacy* is the only Government of the Church by Divine Right, and that exclusive of all others. This is the avowed Design of almost one half of his Book.

Secondly, His *suffering* Church was *Calviniſt* in point of *Doctrine*. *Knox*'s Confession of Faith was formed in the Year 1560; exhibited to and ratified by the Parliament that same Year and oftimes afterward. It was owned as the only Confession of this Church, without Rival without Controul either by *Prelatists* or *Presbyterians* for almost *sixty Years*. I need not tell any Body who has seen it, that it was *Calviniſt* all over. In the Year 1616. the General *Assembly* at *Aberdeen*, wherein Arch-Bishop *Spotswood* was *Moderator*, formed a new Confession of Faith, which we have at length in *Calderwood*'s History from *P.* 638. This was yet more expressly and rigidly *Calviniſt* than the other. In the late *Episcopal* Times, *Knox*'s Confession of Faith was again revived and sworn to in the Oath of the *Test*. The whole *Episcopal* Clergy, except some few that were *Whiggishly* inclin'd and refused it on other Accounts, went into that Oath: And therein not only 'declared that they believed the said Confession to be founded on, 'and agreeable to the written Word of God; *but also* promised and 'swore to adhere thereto during all the Days of their Life-time, *yea* 'and to endeavour to educate their Children therein. After the *Revolution* the *Westminster* Confession of Faith was ratified and esta-

blished

bliſhed as the avowed Confeſſion of this Church. How much *Calviniſt* that is every one knows. Yet in the Year 1692, the *Epiſcopal* Clergy, who deſired to be aſſumed upon the *Formula* before mentioned, promiſed 'that they would ſubſcribe the *ſaid* Confeſſion of 'Faith and larger and ſhorter Catechiſm confirmed by Act of Parliament, as containing the Doctrine of the Proteſtant Religion profeſſed 'in this Kingdom.' This Promiſe, if it ſignified any more than a Jugle, which we ought never to ſuppoſe a Clergy Man guilty of, could import no leſs, than that they own'd the Doctrine of the Said *Confeſſion* and *Catechiſms* to be true, at leaſt, that they did not judge them to be *fundamentally Falſe and Pernicious.* This is a ſhort Hiſtory of all the *Confeſſions of Faith* were ever received in *Scotland* ſince the Reformation. All of them were formed upon the *Calviniſtick* Scheme, all of them have been aſſented to by the *Epiſcopal* Clergy, yet all of them directly contrary to Mr. *Rhind*'s Book in the Doctrine of the Decrees, Predeſtination, Perſeverance, univerſal Redemption, univerſal Grace &c.

Thirdly, His *ſuffering* Church had her *Worſhip* without a *Liturgie. Knox*'s Liturgie was falling into Deſuetude ere *Epiſcopacy* was eſtabliſhed in the Time of King *James* VI. Beſides, Miniſters were never bound to the *conſtant* Obſervance of it. On the contrary, the Book it ſelf allows them *to uſe the ſeveral Forms, or THE LIKE IN EFFECT.* And, ſaith one of its Rubricks, 'It ſhall 'not be neceſſary for the Miniſter daily to repeat all theſe Things 'before Mentioned, but beginning with ſome manner of Confeſſion to proceed to the Sermon; which being ended, he either 'uſeth the Prayer for all Eſtates before mentioned, or elſe prayeth as the Spirit of God ſhall move his Heart, frameing the 'ſame according to the Time, and Matter which he hath entreated of——.' 'Tis true there was an Attempt made in the Time of K. *Charles* I. to bring in a *Liturgie* much after the *Engliſh* Model. But I need not tell the World, that it miſcaried. No wonder: For, not only the Body of the Nation and the Bulk of the *Presbyters*, but even the Wiſeſt and moſt experienced of the *Biſhops* were againſt it. This, *Gilbert Burnet* has Ingenuouſly confeſſed (*b*). This the Author of the *Short Account of Scotland*, though *Epiſco-*

(*b*) Memoires of the Houſe of *Hamilton*. p. 33.

Episcopal, frankly owns page 56. 'It was set on Foot by a Foreigner (*A. B. Laud*) upon the Importunity of some young 'Bishops in the Kirk of Scotland, who made it their Business, 'to oppose the Ancients and thought it Matter of Triumph to 'carry any Point against them. Thus he. In the late Times before the *Revolution*, the *Episcopal* Clergy did not so much as Essay to bring in a *Liturgie*. For many Years after the *Revolution* none of them publickly used any either in their Churches or Meeting-houses. And to this Day some of the best of them, to my certain Knowledge, are against the *English* Liturgie. How then can Mr. *Rhind* pretend to be of their Communion, when he argues not only for the *Excellency*, but even the *Necessity* of Forms; and declares 'Flat Impertinencies, substantial Non- N. B.
'sense and horrid Blasphemies are *UNAVOIDABLE* in 'the Extemporary Way †. And yet I heard the *Extemporary* Prayers of *Episcopal* Ministers five Hunder Times. It seems I have been well employed. And I have known five hunder People harrassed in the late Times for not going to Church to hear such Prayers. It seems it was a mercifull Government that persecuted People for not putting themselves under the *unavoidable* Necessity of hearing horrid Blasphemies by way of Address to God Almighty.

Fourthly, His *Suffering* Church exercised her *Discipline* by *Lay-Elders*; and this every one knows that lived before the *Revolution*. I conclude then that Mr. *Rhind* is not of the Communion of the *Suffering* Church either in point of *Government*, *Faith*, *Worship* or *Discipline*, unless he can prove that she hath changed her Principles in all these within a Score of Years or so; which I suppose it will be hard for him to do. And when he has done it, I cannot think it will contribute much to the raising her Character to represent her as a *CHANGELING*.

Let us go on in our Search after his Church. He gives us a *Third* Hint for finding her, by telling us p. 169. 'That he has embra-'ced the Communion of that Church whose Worship is the best 'in the World with Respect to both Matter and Manner. By which Character he would have us to understand the Church of

 England.

† p. 156. 157.

England. But, though he has embraced her, yet she is so far from embraceing him, that he stands *DE FACTO* Excommunicated by her. I shall have ample Occasion to shew this when I come to consider his second Reason for his *Separation.* In the mean Time, to satisfie the Reader's Longing, I shall give one Instance for Proof of it. Among the other *Presbyterian* Doctrines which he has declared *Fundamentally False and Pernicious* &c. he reckons this as one, *That the best Actions of Men, without Grace, are but so many splendid Sins* †. The Truth of this *Presbyterian* Doctrine is obvious even to common Sense: For, how busie soever a Servant may be, yet if he has no Regard to the Will of his Master in what he does, can his Diligence be reckoned Obedience? Nay, must not the neglect of his Masters Authority be imputed to him as a Fault? But, it is not the Truth of the Doctrine I am now concerned about. Be it true or false, is it not the Doctrine of the Church of *England* as much as of the *Presbyterians?* Hear her.

Art. XIII.

'WORKS done before the Grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God; For as much 'as they spring not of Faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make 'Men meet to receive Grace or (as the School Authors say) de'serve Grace of *Congruity:* yea rather, for that they are not 'done as God hath commanded and willed them to be done, We 'doubt not but that they have the Nature of Sin.

'Tis plain then that he has impugned and rejected the Doctrine of the Church of *England.* Now let us hear what Censure she has awarded to such as do so.

Canon V. 1603.

'WHosoever shall hereafter affirm That any of the XXXIX 'Articles agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of 'both Provinces and whole Clergy in the Convocation holden at

'*Londom*

† P. 136. 137. 189.

'*London* in the Year of our Lord 1562 for the avoiding of Diversities of Opinions, and for the Establishing of Consent touching True 'Religion, are in any Part Superstitious or Erroneous, or such as 'he may not with a *Good Conscience* subscribe unto; let him be 'Excommunicated *IPSO FACTO*, and not restored but only by 'the Archbishop, after his Repentance and publick Revocation of 'such his Wicked Errors.

Who now will say that Mr. *Rhind* is of the Church of *England* Communion, when she has excommunicated him. I conclude then upon the whole, That it is not possible to find that Church wherein he can be classed, I mean, here on Earth. As for the *UNSPOTTED* Church † of which the late *Edinburgh* Addressers professed themselves to be, I don't believe it to be on this side the Clouds.

Sect. II.

Containing Remarks on Mr. Rhind's *Preface.*

OUR *Apologist* is earnest to have his Reader believe that it was not upon any sinful Byas or Wordly Consideration that he changed Sides. And therefore in the Beginning of his *Preface* tells us, 'That a forcible Conviction, which was the Re'sul of an Impartial Enquiry, determin'd him to abandon the 'Presbyterian Party *SOME YEARS AGO* when the Church 'was under severe Pressures in this Nation and when there were 'small hopes of Deliverance. But, he has been too General in the Date of his Conversion, and some People are tempted to think there was a Reason for it. Her Majesty was pleased *SOME YEARS AGO* to write a Gracious Letter to her Privy Council of *Scotland* of the Date *Feb.* 4. 1703. in favours of the *Episcopal* Clergy and others of that Profession. Her Majesty was so far from intending that the said Letter should have any ill Influence on the *Presbyterian* Establishment, that on the Contrary she recommended it to Her

† See *London* Gazette Numb. 3080.

Council to give them all Due Countenance and Encouragement! Yet it is abundantly well known in this Nation, That the *Episcopal* Party constructed the said Letter as a *Preface* to the overturning of *Presbytry* and the Reestablishment of *Prelacy*; As if her Majesty, like a kind Mother teazed with hungry Children, had bid them content themselves a little with that Morsel, till she could get Dinner provided for them. And, in Opposition to all her Majesties Promises and Assurances to the Contrary, the Distinction betwixt a *Secret* and *Revealed* Will was industriously propagated. And from that Time some young Divines, who hitherto had been warmed and Fledged, under the Wings of *Presbytry*, began to look with a more kindly Eye towards the *Prelatick* Party, and to alter their Conduct accordingly. If Mr. *Rhind*'s Separation was prior to that Time, there is the more Charity to be had for him, and he was not Kind enough to himself in not signifieing so much. But if it was *after* it, I can see nothing Extraordinary in it: For, to run from under a falling House, and to Worship the riseing Sun, is what *People* do every Day.

Besides, how little Encouragement soever Mr. *Rhind* might hope for from the *SUFFERING* Church in *Scotland*, yet he might very reasonably, upon his revolt, expect more elsewhere than ever he could have found among the *Presbyterians*. A *Presbyterian* Minister is like the Heath in the Wilderness that never grows higher. When once he has got himself possessed of a Church, however shineing his Parts are, there is a *ne plus ultra* set to his Ambition. But in the *Prelatick* Way there are various Degrees of *Dignity* to animate the generous Spirit. 'Tis possible one may Rise from a *Curat* to a *Rector* from thence to a *Dean*, *Archdeacon* or so, at length obtain a Mitre, and never cease advanceing till he hath lodged himself in *Lambeth*. Though I will not suppose Mr. *Rhind* so airy as ever to have Dreamed of mounting the highest Pinacle of Honour; yet had he so humble an Opinion of himself as not to allow himself to think that he might one Day merit some of the *greater* Church *Dignities*? Was it no Motive to him to know that there are *People* in the World much fonder of a Protelyt from *Presbytry* than from *Paganism*. And that the writeing of an *Apology* might very much contribute to his Advancement? He does not seem to

be

to be very much a Stranger to good Authors, as not to have heard of *Juvenal*'s Secret for riseing in the World.

> *Wou'dst thou to Honours and Preferments Climb,*
> *Be bold in Mischief, dare some mighty Crime.*
> Mr. *Dryden* sat. 1. l. 73.

And is not Dr. *Sacheverel* a Fresh Instance of the Wisdom of that Precept, whose *high Misdemeanours* made him at once the Idol and Darling of high Church, the Theam of her Praise, and Object of her Bounty.

II. He has been pleased in his *Preface* to give his own favourable Judgement of his Performance, of the *Plainness of his Style and Thought*, the *Linking of his Arguments* and so on. And I think it cannot be amiss to give mine too, before I enter on the Book it self. Besides the *ill Nature* (already noticed) which bewrays it self almost in *every* Page, and is sometimes continued through *many*, without so much as *one* Ray of Truth to qualifie it. Besides this, I say, his Book bears *Three* other Characters, none of the most lovely indeed yet too Remarkable to escape Notice. I mean, *Vanity*, *Dogmaticalness* and *Prophaness*.

1. *Vanity*. With a very distinguishing Air he assures the Reader †
'That he meant something else by the length of his Narrative
'than to add to the Number of his Pages. This was so necessary an *Innuendo*, so pretty a Phrase, that he thought fit to repeat it again in his own Favours p. 79. He had before told, in his printed Sermon on *Liturgy*, *That his Genius and the Course of his Studies had habituated him to some Application of Thought.* This was of so great Moment to be known, perhaps so hard to be gathered from his Writeings, that he now tells it over again in his *Apology* p. 159. Again p. 199 he dispenses with himself from *writeing a Lecture on the Animal Oeconomy and accounting Mechanically for all the Phænomena of the* Presbyterian *Devotion, because he wants Leisure.* No doubt. Yet some People think it had been not only as *Modest*, but as *True* an Excuse to have said he wanted *Ability.* In the mean Time

† Preface p. 2.

he is not so just as to own that what he has already advanced on that Head he ows to Dr. *Scot* in his Sermon on *Bodily Exercise* from 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. and other Places of his Works.

2. *Dogmaticalness.* He writes with the same Positive Air as if he were infallible. Every thing adduced on the Presbyterian Side is with him *Weakness*, *Prejudice*, an Argument of a *Desperate Cause* and the like. What he himself advances, is put beyond all Doubt, and he hopes *Every discerning and unprejudiced Reader will take the Hint, and be convinced as well as he.* Nay it shall be an *Impeachment of the Divine Wisdom* to think differently from him. Nay our Lord himself behoved to do according to Mr. *Rhind*'s Dictates. Repeated Instances of this Presumption we shall meet with afterwards. The most Learned of the *Arminian* Side in the Church of *England* have owned, that the *Calvinists* have to say for their Opinions on the Controverted Points, what is not to be easily answered. But there is nothing too hard for Mr. *Rhind. Conditional Decrees, Freewill*, the *Apostacy of the Saints, Universal Redemption, Universal Grace* are all as clear to him as Self-evident Propositions. Nay, so strong has his Fancy wrought; that, as if he had for ever decided the *Episcopal*, *Arminian*, and *Liturgical* Controversies, He concludes his Book in the Mathematical Stile with a *Q. E. D.*

3. *Profaneſs.* He sets himself industriously from pag. 189. to pag. 207. to put the most sacred Things in the most Burlesque Air possible. *The Presbyterians*, saith he, pag. 200, *tell a long but senseless Story of the Manner of Gods dealing with the Souls of his Elect, how the Work of Grace is carried on there, and how their Regeneration is compleated.*— 'Tis true, the *Presbyterians* do talk of these Things; but how long and senseless soever the Story is, the Substance of it is what every good Man feels; 'Tis what the Spirit of God works; 'Tis a Story which the Church of *England* Divines, the most judicious of them *(i)*, Bishops too among the Rest, have told a thousand times over, and some of them very lately *(k)*. I am not to repeat the rest of his impious Stuff vomited out on that Head; once printing it was too much. I only wish that our *Prelatick* Writers, tho' they don't regard Man, yet would at

[*i*] See Hooker's Sermons subjoined to his Eccles. Polit. Edit. *London* 1705. [*k*] Bishop *Hopkins*, Dr. *Edwards*, &c.

at leaſt fear God. For I ſuppoſe that no Man that reads the latter Part of Mr. *Rhind*'s Book will ſtick to acknowledge that *Lucian*, *Celſus*, *Vaninus*, *Spinoſa*, *Blount*, may be reckoned modeſt Chriſtians in Compariſon of him.

III. Towards the End of the *Preface*, Mr. *Rhind*, apprehending ſome one or other might eſſay to diſprove his *Apology*, thinks fit to beſpeak civil Uſage for himſelf; with Certification, that in Caſe he is not thus uſed, *He will expoſe the Presbyterians yet more fully to the World.* Were I of his Council, I wou'd adviſe him, ere he proceed further, once to prove the Characters whereby he has already attempted to expoſe them, leſt he eſtabliſh a Character upon himſelf and the Party He ſerves that will be none of the moſt honourable. Nor let him fear it will be reckoned Pedantry to ſtudd his Margin with Vouchers: For I can aſſure him, the World is now ſo much Infidel, *Whigs* eſpecially, as not much to regard Aſſertion without Probation. If the *Presbyterians* are ſuch as he has repreſented them, he cannot expect civil Uſage from them. And if they are not ſuch, he may be ſenſible he has not deſerved it. However, to make him eaſy, I ſhall promiſe him all fair Quarter, and reſent his Invectives no otherwiſe than by Neglect: Or if I chance at any Time to draw his Picture, it ſhall be with Canvaſs and Colours of his own furniſhing.

IV. I am now to enter on the Book it ſelf. I have heard it both from *Prelatiſts* and *Presbyterians*, that it was not done by Mr. *Rhind* himſelf, but that his *Separation* haveing given the Occaſion, a better Hand than his did the Work, and borrowed his Name to it. The *Prelatiſts* poſſibly give out this to gain the greater Reputation to the Performance. But if ſo, 'tis a very mean *Politick*: For, by how much it magnifies the Book, it diſgraces the Man, and at once leſſens their own Trophy and the *Presbyterian*'s Loſs. The *Presbyterians* found on this, that while he attended his Studies among them, tho' his Zeal againſt the *Prelats* was flaming high, yet his other Accompliſhments did not ſeem proportional. In a Word, That he did not make ſuch a Figure as promiſed an Author. But this Conjecture alſo is too weak. For Years and Application do oftimes make ſurprizing Changes on Young Perſons. I do indeed believe that the Book was written at the Deſire, and publiſhed upon the Approbation of the Leaders

Leaders of the *Party*. But I as firmly believe Mr. *Rhind* to be the true Father; and seeing he owns the Book and none else claims it, I can see no Reason why any Body should believe otherwise. I am so much convinced it is his, that I take the whole Book to be pieced up of *Sermons*, he had preached at several Occasions, or at least of large Shreds of them artfully tacked together. Some such *Sermons* were necessary to ingratiat him with his new *Masters*, his *harangueing* Way seems rather adapted for *Sermons* (according to the *Episcopal* Way of Sermonizing) than for a Dispute. And which confirms all, I find a good Part of his *Sermon upon Liturgie*, which he preached and printed in the Year 1711 engrossed *verbatim* into his *Apology*, tho' he has not acquainted his Reader therewith.

Sect. III.

Containing Remarks on Mr. Rhinds *Narrative of the* Manner *how He separated from the* Presbyterian *Party. From* P. 1. *to* P. 29.

THE Sum of his *Narrative* is, That he was educated *Presbyterian*, turned *Sceptick* upon *Choice*, that he might find out the Truth; the Result of which was that he *separated* upon *Conviction*. He has indeed gone far to scarr one from Quarrelling the Account he has given, by promising p. 6. to deliver the same *with as much Sincerity as shall be these Words with which he hopes to commend his Soul at last to God*. And yet I must needs declare, I do not find My Self obliged even in *Charity*, much less in *Justice* to believe it. I cannot help thinking it is a *Piece* of *Poesie* rather than *History*, a *handsome Fiction* of the Method he thinks he *ought* to have taken, rather than a *real Account* of what *in Fact* he did take. I am aware how hardly this my Judgement may be constructed of. But I crave to be heard, and then let the Reader give Sentence.

By Mr. *Rhind*'s own Account p. 6. He was educated *Presbyterian*. When

When he had run through the ordinary Course of the *Languages* and *Philosophy* and commenced *Master of Arts*, He applyed himself, to the Study of *Divinity*. After several Years Attendance on that, he went home to his own Country the Shire of *Ross* to undergo Trials in Order to be licensed a Preacher.

All this while he was so far from being suspected to incline to *Prelacy*, that he received particular Favours from the *Presbyterians*, as he himself owns p. 7. And as he *was* not suspected, so indeed there was no apparent Reason why he *should*: For he owns p. 8. not only that he was really *Presbyterian* in his Judgment, but that he was a Zealot in that Way.

By all this Account we find him at least 21 Years of Age Compleat: For no sooner do the *Presbyterians* admit Men to be Preachers, or enter Them on *Tryals* for that End. And yet all this Time he had not entertain'd a Thought of *Separating*; nay he had not brought his Mind to a Suspence or *Equilibrium* about the Controversy: For, how could he essay to Commence Preacher amongst the *Presbyterians*, while he was undetermin'd to the one Side or the other?

Again he tells us p. 152 that he was but 22 Years among the *Presbyterians*. There is then but *one* Year left for doing all these Things, and makeing all these Enquiries he mentions in his *Narrative*, and at last determining himself. But if he did 'em all in *one* Year, I dare be bold to pronounce it was a Miracle: Being well assured it would have employed any ordinary Man *seven*. A short abstract of his *Narrative* will sufficiently demonstrate this.

1. When the *Luckie Minute* was come that was to give a Beginning to his Conversion, he conceived a very just Suspicion that the many Opinions, wherewith he found his Mind crowded, were not all either well come by or right founded. From this he concluded, that therefore it was reasonable if not necessary to examine and bring them to the Test. But in order to this *Prejudices were to be shaken off.* p. 9. 10. Every Body that has a competent Knowledge of himself will allow that this was not to be done without Time.

2. Thus prepared, He made the first Experiment in some *Philosophical* Points. And, after a *most Impartial* and *Accurat Examination*

nation found, That what formerly he had admitted upon a supposed scientifick Evidence was in it self absolutly False p. 11. Every one will own that this was not to be done at a Start.

3. Thence he proceeded to try whether his *Religious* Opinions were not as ill founded as his *Philosophical* ones. For that End he threw himself into a State of absolute *Scepticism*, and found that he had yeilded too Implicite an Assent to them. p. 12. Supposeing this had been Lawfull, yet, I hope, it will be granted it was not the Work of a Day.

4. After all this Labour to unhinge himself, he next began to search where he might fix. To that Purpose he entered upon the *most Impartial* and *Accurat* Examination of the *Essential* Articles of Religion he was able to make; and ceased not till he was *rationally* perswaded about the Truth of a *Natural* Religion. p. 13. This, considering how many fine Books have been writ on that Subject, and how many shrewd Things have been advanced against it by such as are called the *Wits* of the World, and, which Mr. *Rhind*'s curious *Genius* would undoubtedly engage him to peruse, wou'd be sufficient to exercise him a very considerable Time.

5. He next carried his Enquiries to *revealed* Religion; and examin'd the *necessity* of Revelation, the *certainty* of that which is owned as such by Christians, in a Word the *Truth* of the *Christian* Religion and the *Divinity* of the Holy Scriptures. *Ibid.* What a large Subject of Disquisition this is, and how much Time it wou'd require may be easily conjectured.

6. When he had got himself convinced of the Truth of the *Christian* Religion, his Labour was but beginning: For Christians being multiplied into so many Sects, which of them could he believe in the Right, when each of them pretended to be so? He resolved then only to examine the Pretensions of the most considerable Parties *viz.* The *Roman* Catholicks and *Protestants*. For that End he laid aside all Prejudices and seriously examin'd *all* that is commonly adduced for or against the *Roman* Catholick Way. p. 14. 15. Now, who knows not, that the *Popish* Controversies are so very large a Field, as to require several years Travel to get through them to Purpose?

7. He parted Ways with this Infallible Church; though upon a very

very small Quarrel, as we shall hear afterward. But then he found the *Protestants* canton'd into so many Parties, that he was in a great Quandary where to *find rest for the Sole of his Foot*. Wherefore, to shorten his Work, he resolved to confine his Examination to the *Episcopal* and *Presbyterian* Perswasions. And here it cost him both Time and Pains to divest himself of his Prepossessions in favours of *Presbytry*, and to shake of the Prejudices he had contracted or been educate in against *Episcopacy*, and to fortifie his Soul against the Tentations of Persecution and Want in Case he were determined to the *Episcopal* Side. p. 16.--- 20.

This being done he entered upon a very huge Task.

1. He did read the Old and New Testament all over p. 20. Now though a *Shift* may be made to get through that Book in a short Time, yet it is a large one, and when one applys himself to read it with a View to be determined by it in controverted Points, which was Mr. *Rhind*'s Case, He'll find it a considerable Labour.

2. After the *Bible*, he engaged himself in reading the Works of the *Fathers*, especially those of the *three* first Ages. In which Course of reading he *narrowly* observed *whatever* could serve to determin the Controversies in Hand. p. 21. 22. This was a yet larger task than the Former; for tho' he had never gone beyond the third Age; yet, to get through the Works of *Clemens Romanus*, *Barnabas*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Hermas*, *Justin Martyr*, *Athenagoras*, *Theophilus*, *Tatianus*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Minutius Felix*, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, &c. To get through all these I say, with the *Histories* relateing to their Times, was Sufficient to employ one a longer Time than Mr. *Rhind*'s Account can well admit of.

3. And yet he was not near an End of his Toil: For being curious to know *whatever* was written on the Head of Government, he read the Controvertists of both sides on *all* the Subjects in Debate. In which, he declares, He was so *scrupulously exact* that he does not remember *any* Author of *any* Name whom he did not peruse except *Salmasius* alone, which he could not come by. p. 22---25. This was to be diligent in good Earnest: For, to read on the *Episcopal* Side *Andrews*, *Bancroft*, *Bilson*, *Burges*, *Chillingworth*,

lingworth, Downham, Dodwell, Hooker, Hall, Heylin, Hammond, Honneyman, Maurice, Monro, Saravia, Sage, Scot, Sutlivius, Tilen. On the *Presbyterian* Side *Beza, Bain, Bucer, Blondel, Bailie, Cartwright, Calderwood, Clarkson, Gillespie, Forrester, Jameson, Rutherfoord, Rule,* with a long *et cætera* on both sides, to read all these Authors, I say, and to read them so as duely to weigh the Arguments, Objections, Answers, Exceptions and Replys was a *Herculean* Labour. But where is there Time for it by Mr. *Rhind*'s Account? And yet he had not done with it. For

4. As to the other Controversies that relate to *Doctrine, Worship* &c. He consulted the respective Authors *pro* and *con.* p. 26. That is to say, he studied the *Arminian* and *Liturgical* Controversies, which, Every one knows, require both much Time and great Application. Yet after all this he was only shocked, not absolutly determin'd. For

5. To the Study of *Books* he added *Conversation* with learned *Men,* he collected his Observations on the Spirit and Principles of the Party of which he had so long been; and took Time to inform himself about what he did not know of the other. And narrowly observed how the *Spirit* and *Principles* of both discovered themselves by overt ACTS. All this he did, not *once* but *many* Times; and after all this he had his Soul to work up to a due Seriousness and Intention of Thought; and then *once more* recollected what he had learned from Men, Books, or his own Experience *for* or *against* either Principle or Party. Not till this was done, and the Aid and Direction of God invocked, was he determin'd in his Judgment. And even when he was determin'd, Bashfullness or Fear restrained Him, till at last a forcible Conviction and the severe Remonstrances of his Conscience obliged him publickly to declare himself p. 26---29.

This is his Account; but now, how a Man could do all this within the Space of 22 Years, when he had not so much as a Thought of doing any Thing of it at an Age wherein he was capable to be a Preacher, which we cannot suppose earlier than 21; that is, in a Word, how Mr. *Rhind* could do that in *one* Year, which wou'd have kept any ordinary Man constantly busie *Seven* Years, He has yet to account for to the World. And till it be done, he must excuse his Readers, Me at least, from believing the Sincerity of his *Narrative,*

not-

notwithstanding the Solemnity of his Asseveration. And so I proceed in my Remarks.

II. Tho' Mr. *Rhind* has told us p. 6. *That he ows his Birth to Presbyterian Parents*, yet he has conceal'd his having been baptized by a *Presbyterian* Minister. Did it look like Sincerity to dissemble that which was of so great Moment to be known? I seriously declare I do not intend *Banter* or *Raillery* by this particular; but touch upon it, because, according to Mr. *Rhind*'s Principles, it is of the last Consequence not only to himself but possibly to many others. He is in a much worse Condition than if he had been baptized by a meer Layman or Midwife in the Church of *England:* For, tho' Baptism as dispensed by them is irregular, yet being Christians, within the Church, and having at least the Connivance of the *Bishop*, it is not *Invalid* and therefore is not repeated, *ordinarly* at least. But *Presbyterian* Ministers are no Christians. They are by his Scheme, not only *without the Church*, but Enemies to it. Their Baptism then is null and can have no Effect, even tho' the Person is afterwards confirmed by the *Bishop*: For, what is in its own Nature null can never be made valid by a Posterior Deed: And therefore, as Dr. *Hicks* informs us (*l*) the Church has provided the *Office* for the *Baptism of those of riper Years*, which was not Originally in the *Liturgie*, on Purpose to answer the Case of Persons in such Circumstances. This must needs affect Mr. *Rhind* very heavily: For, according to his own Principles concerning Baptism *, He is no Christian, is without Grace, incapable of Salvation, can neither be Priest nor Deacon, consequently the Baptism dispensed by him to others is Null; Consequently, by his Principles, they must all be Damned if *Extraordinary* Mercy interpose not. I could not think of all this without Horror, and therefore am in Pain till I hear how he extricats himself. By all I can apprehend there is but one Way to save him and prevent further Mischief, viz. to get *Episcopal* Baptism. If he is not convinced of the Necessity of this by what I have said, I recommend to him to read Mr. *Laurence*'s late Book of the *Invalidity of Lay-Baptism*, where he may have all Objections answered, and both Arguments and an Example to perswade him.

III.

[l] Preface to the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism. * p. 177. &c.

III. Mr. *Rhind* still professes that, while he was among the *Presbyterians*, he was *without the Church* and incapable of Salvation. One would think therefore that he should have ascribed to God the first Hint was given him to make his Escape out of so dangerous a State. Even the Church of *England* Divines themselves who have gone off the *Calvinian* Scheme do yet acknowledge a *preventing* Grace. But does Mr. *Rhind* this? No. He ascribes it to himself and his own Thought; and that, as I take Him, under a favourable *Planetary* Aspect. *When I had arrived*, saith he p. 9. *at a competent Age, in some lucky minute, my Thoughts suggested to me the reasonableness of my enquiring into my Opinions about Things.* God is not brought into the Account here, Nay he has not so much as a Hint of addressing him by Prayer, till he had DETERMIN'D himself as to *Natural* Religion, till he had got himself perswaded of the Truth of the *Christian* Religion, and till he had resolved himself against the *Romish*. *After all this*, and no sooner, *did he address the God of all Truth* p. 19. This Conduct of his was design'd and founded upon *two* Reasons which the Reader may weigh at his Pleasure. First, He is so much an Enemy to *Enthusiasm*, that he did not think it would become him to impute any Motion in his Soul to the Spirit of God: For the *Manner of God's Dealing with the Souls of his Elect is but a senseless Story*, and it was below his Philosophical Genius *to ascribe that to a Divine Efficiency which might otherwise be accounted for.* Secondly, His Story would not have told right, if he should have owned God. For he was resolved to throw himself into a State of *Scepticism*, wherein he was to suspend the Belief of the Being of a God. And in that State it had been very unaccountable to pray to him: *For every one that comes to God, must believe that he is.* It will therefore be very necessary that Mr. *Rhind* in his next explain a little upon the *lucky Minute*, because People are much in the Dark about it.

IV. Mr. *Rhind* p. 7. makes Mention in general of his Obligations to the *Presbyterians*. But did he intend thereby to testify his Gratitude? No. The whole Strain of his Book is Evidence that he had lost all Impressions of that; but he does it, that he may raise his own Character, by shewing, against how great Tentations to the contrary he had separate from *Them*, and upon what Disinterested Views he had come over to the *Episcopal* Side. This is plain from his own Words

Words p. 8. ' And if now that I am none of theirs; and if after ' having received so many Discourtesies from them, I do still entertain ' a gratefull Resentment of their Favours, Imagine how deep the ' Impression must have been, and how much I would be prejudi- ' cate in Their behalf, when actually allowed very liberal Ex- ' pressions of Their Favour and Esteem.....I cannot perswade My Self that such Artifice wou'd become a Man recommending His Soul to God in His last Minutes.

V. I said before That He parted Ways with the Church of *Rome* upon a very slender Quarrel. What was it? Take it in His own Words *p.* 15. ' Though I had been convinced of the ' Truth of all the Articles of Pope *Pius*'s Creed, (which *you may think*, ' would argue a strong Faith, & a great Deal of Violence offered to my ' Reason) yet could I never be perswaded, That the Damning ' of all who did not believe as I did, should be a Condition of ' My Salvation. In a word, the *absq; qua Fide, &c* which They ' had made a Term of Communion and an *Article of Their Faith*, ' was so choaking that it would not believe for Me: And as the ' Disbelief of this one *Article*, would hinder Their receiving Me, ' into Their Communion; So indeed, this alone abundantly con- ' vinced Me, that I should never enter into it? For understanding this, the Reader must know, that Pope *Pius*'s Creed, after a Rehearsal of the several Articles, hath this affixed, *and the same true Catholick Faith*, WIHOUT WHICH NO MAN CAN BE SAVED.... *I the same N do vow and swear.* This *damning* Clause was the Quarrel; but I affirm that, supposeing *he had been convinced of the Truth of all the other Articles*, it was no good one; because he has already done the same. The Church of *England*, to which Mr. *Rhind* has join'd himself, hath engrossed the *Athanasian* Creed in her *Liturgy:* And yet that Creed has at least *two* such damning Clauses, and in harder Words too; one in the Beginning. ' Who- ' soever will be saved, before all Things it is necessary that he ' hold the Catholick Faith, which Faith except every one do keep ' Holy and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. ' *Another at the End.* This is the Catholick Faith, which except ' a Man believe faithfully he cannot be saved.

Why then did He refuse the *Roman* Catholick Communion, for that

that which he has approved of in the Church of *England* Communion? I cannot say it was unwisely done: For, the smaller the *Quarrel* was, the easier may the *Reconciliation* be.

VI. While Mr. *Rhind* is giveing an Account of his own Study of the *Fathers*, he falls heavily p. 21 upon the *Presbyterians* for their want of Respect to them. But has he adduced in all his Book one Instance from the Writings of the *Presbyterians* to prove his Charge? Not one. What meant he then? Why he knew that was a *Common-place* for declaiming on among his Party, and it had been a Pity to miss it. No other Proof has he for his Charge, unless you'll be so kind as to take his own Assertions. *They who had the Directions of my Studies*, saith he, *never recommended to me the reading so much as of one Father.* No wonder truly, it was soon enough to begin the Study of the *Fathers* at the Age of 22. Most part of young Men are not sooner Ripe for it; and at that Age Mr. *Rhind* separated. Bishop *Burnet* is thought to have tolerable good Skill in training young *Theologues*, now hear him (*m*). 'It may 'seem strange, that in this whole Direction, I have said nothing 'concerning the Study of the *Fathers* or *Church History*. But I 'said at first, That a great Distinction was to be made between 'what was necessary to prepare a Man to be a Priest, and what 'was Necessary to make him a compleat and learned *Divine*. The 'knowledge of these Things is necessary to the latter, though they 'do not seem so necessary for the former: There are many 'Things to be left to the Prosecution of a Divines Study, that 'therefore are not mentioned here, without any design to dispa'rage that sort of Learning. Thus He. But, proceeds Mr. *Rhind*, *I frequently heard them talk contemptibly of them and their Works, excepting still St.* Augustines *Books* of *Predestination* and *Grace*. That excellent Person Mr. *George Meldrum*, late *Professor* of *Divinity* at *Edinburgh* was he who *had the Direction of Mr.* Rhind's *Studies*. If *He* talked contemptibly of the *Fathers*, I can say from my own personal Knowledge of Him, to be confirmed by many Thousands yet alive; that it was what he hardly ever did of any Body else. Mr. *Rhind* then must prove this ere he is Believed.

But

(*m*) Pastoral Care, p. 195.

But while he charges the *Presbyterians* so fiercely on this Head, why does he himself give such a *Contemptible* Hint of *Augustin*? Why p. 114 talks he so *contemptibly* of *Jerom That he contradicts himself* &c? Why, *Augustin* was for the Doctrines of *Predestination* and *Grace*, and *Jerom* for *Presbytry*, both which are Mr. *Rhind*'s Aversion; yet one would think he should not deny that Freedom to *Presbyterians* which he takes to himself. The *Presbyterians* willingly acknowledge that the *Fathers* have done excellent Things; yet they don't believe They were infallible. They stick not to say that the *Fathers* were subject to the same Infirmities with other Men, and their Works as full of gross Escapes as these of latter Authors, and that they wrote (as themselves acknowledge) crudedly and loosely till Heresies and Schisms arising taught them more Correctness. And do not the Church of *England* Divines talk as *contemptibly* of them as all this, or whatever else Presbyterians have said of them can amount to? Yes. Never was there a Set of Writers in the World that treated the *Fathers* more homely and coarsely than they do. The only Difference is, that they fall into this Strain, when they find the Fathers to be *against* Them. But then when they either are *One*, or can be screwed *over* to their own Side, Oh then! the *Fathers* are all Oracles, and 'tis the Sin of *Cham* to open a Mouth against Them. Need I cite Instances to prove all this? No. 'Tis clear to every one that's acquaint with their Writeings, yet I shall give one or two for satisfieing the Reader. One of Mr. *Rhind*'s learned Brethren of the Clergy † has lately appeared very loudly in Defence of the Book *about Antichrist* ascribed to *Hippolitus*, though no Man that had not quite prostitute His Sense would have done it. He has been told how *Coke*, *Fulk*, *Whitaker* three famous Divines of the Church of *England* have disparaged it, and how Monsieur *le Fevre* that eminent *Critick* hath made a Jest of it, and how, supposeing it were, what he would have it to be, it yet makes nothing for his Purpose. Yet he, like a true *Teague*, is resolved to keep his Text, whatever he say on it. To put him in Humour then, after so much Wrath, it shall be allowed that *Hippolitus*'s Book is Genuine. Now hear

† Mr. *Calder*.

with what profound Reſpect *Jewell* Biſhop of *Salisbury* treats (*n*) the Reverend Father and his Work. ' 'Tis a very little Book, ' of *ſmall Price* and as *ſmall Credit*- - It appeareth it was ſome ' *ſimple Man* that wrote the Book, both for the Phraſes of his Speech ' in the *Greek* Tongue, which commonly are *very Childiſh*, and ' alſo for the *Truth* and *Weight* of the Matter. He beginneth the ' firſt Sentence of his Book with *Enim* which a *very Child* would ſcarcely do. After a Recital of ſeveral of his Blunders he adds. ' And this he ſaith without either *Warrant* of the *Scriptures*, or ' *Authority* of the *Church*- - He alledgeth the Apocalypſe of S. *John* ' in the Stead of *Daniel*, which is a Token of *great Ignorance* ' or of *marvellous Oblivion*. Say now, what Diſcipline a *Presbyterian* had deſerved, had he treated ſo worthy a Father ſo familiarly. Take another Inſtance. Biſhop *Whitgift* (*o*) runs a Compariſon 'twixt the *Fathers* and the *Engliſh* Biſhops in *Truth of Doctrine*, *Honeſty of Life*, and *Right uſe of External Things*, and very mannerly gives the Preference to himſelf and his Colleagues in all the three. If theſe Inſtances are not ſufficient, Mr. *Rhind* may have five hunder moe upon demand, and perhaps ſome of them ere we have done *. To put an End for ever to this Topick of declaiming againſt the *Presbyterians*, I here challange the *Epiſcopalians* to make a Collection of all the *Contemptible* Things the *Presbyterians* have written of the Fathers. And if I do not make as *large* a Collection of as *Contemptible* Things that the *Epiſcopal* Authors have written of them, it ſhall be owned they have Reaſon for their Declamations. If they refuſe this, they muſt give us a Reaſon why they may make bold with the Fathers, and the *Presbyterians* not. Have *Prelatiſts* only the Priviledge of railing at 'em?

VII. Mr. *Rhind* gives an ample enough Commendation to the Writers of his own Way. *I found them all*, ſaith he, p. 23. *to be Men of Diſcretion and Senſe, ſo that ſhould I name* all *whom I thought to have acted their Part handſomly, I ſhould have* none *unnamed*. Is this the *Sincerity* he promiſed? Could he find never *one* ſenſeleſs Author on the *Epiſcopal* Side? Why certainly he has looked on them with a Lover's Eye; for who is there that knows not, that the Confuſion of Languages

(*n*) Reply to M. *Hardings* Anſ. Art. 1. Div. 5. (*o*) Defence of the Anſ. p. 472.

Languages at *Babel* was never greater than is among the *Episcopal* Writers? Where shall we find any *two* of them that go entirely upon the same Scheme? Does not every Body know how they mutually reject each others Arguments? Should I instance any of their Writers whom I judge to have performed but so and so, I know I would be declined as a partial Judge; but let us hear one of Themselves giveing the Character of his Fellows that went before him. Mr. *Thomas Edwards* asserts (*p*) of them, That as to their Proofs out of Scripture, 'They understood not what they said, nor whereof they affirmed. And in a later Book (*q*) He is so far from repenting of these hard Words, that 'he hopes every Body will grant he had reason for Them. And he would not have this meant of *one* or *two* only of his Fellow Writers, but of the whole Bulk of them. And therefore he *pulls down the whole Frame of Episcopacy* to build it after his own new and better Fashion. Now either M. *Edwards* has not acted his part handsomely, or none of the rest have: For it is sure but a sorry Way of *acting*, when *one knows not what he says, or whereof he affirms.*

VIII. Of all the *Episcopal* Authors Mr. *Rhind* gives the Preference to M. *Dodwell* and M. *Sage* †. To the first particularly for his *Book of Schism*, and that of the *One Priesthood and one Altar*; and to the latter for his *Principles of the Cyprianick Age* and the *Vindication* thereof.

That M. *Dodwell* was a Man of vast Reading and Abstract Life every one must acknowledge; but that his Books are of a most pernicious Tendency, I am well perswaded, no one ought to deny. For, in Order to make Room for planting *Prelacy*; He hath, so far as his Principles prevail, not only destroyed Charity, but grubbed up the very Roots of Christianity, yea of Natural Religion. Whether this be an unjust Censure, I refer it to the Reader upon hearing of the following Account.

His Book *against Schism* he published in the Year 1679 When the Civil Government did not want to have a bad Opinion of the *Nonconformists*. Therein he attempts to prove not only that the Separatists from *Episcopal* Government are *Schismaticks*, but (*r*) That no Prayers made by themselves, nor by others for them can find Acceptance with God, except such Prayers as are put up for their Con-

[*p*] Discourse against Extemporary Prayer. [*q*] Diocesan Episcopacy proved from Holy Scriptures, P. 231. † p. 24. (*r*) Chap. XI. Sect. 7.

verſion from the Schiſm, and that their Separation is the *Sin unto Death* ſpoken of by S. *John* 1 Ep. chap. 5. ver. 16. That, (*s*) that dreadfull Text Heb. 6. 4, 5, 6. *It is impoſſible for thoſe that were once enlightened* ---is applicable to them. That (*t*) they are guilty of the ſame Crime, and as real Enemies to Chriſt as theſe who in Terms profeſſed him to be an *Impoſtor*. That (*v*) ſuch Separation is a *Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt*, and (*x*) an Interpretative diſowning Chriſt for our Maſter. Nay (*y*) that it is as Criminal as the Sin of the Angells, and the *Old World*, and the *Sodomites*, and the *Iſraelites* in the Wilderneſs. In a Word, That nothing is effectual to Salvation without being in the *Epiſcopal* Communion. I poſe now Mr. *Rhind* to find any thing more impious and ſcandalous in *Spinoſa*'s Book, to which, he ſaies, the *Presbyterians* compare M. *Dodwell*'s.

This, one would have thought, was enough for one Man in his whole Life. But M. *Dodwell* did not think ſo. The Parliament of *England*, conſidering the great Danger the Nation was in from *Popery*; ſaw it was neceſſary to have better Thoughts of the *Diſſenters*, and to give them more Countenance than would have followed upon his Principles: And therefore ſhortly after the publiſhing of his Book, viz. upon the *tenth* of *January* 1680 the *Commons* declared by their Vote *nemine contradicente*. 'It is the Opinion of this Houſe that 'the Proſecution of Proteſtant Diſſenters upon the Penal Laws is at 'this Time grievous to the Subject, a weakening the Proteſtant In-'tereſt, an Encouragement to Popery, and dangerous to the Peace 'of the Kingdom. This was plainly to blaſt all Hopes of the Fruits might otherwiſe have been expected from M. *Dodwell*'s Book. Wherefore he makes a *ſecond* Attaque, and in the Year 1683 publiſhed his Book of the *One Prieſthood, one Altar*, wherein he over again attempted to prove the Nonconformiſts *Schiſmaticks*, and imagining he had done it, inferrs (*z*) that they can lay no Claim to the *One Altar* nor to the *One Prieſthood*, to the *Favour* of God here, nor the *Enjoyment* of him hereafter.

It was no Wonder he was thus ſevere upon the *Diſſenters*: For he proceeded, and made the Church of *England* her ſelf upon the *Revolution*

[*s*] Chap. XIII. [*t*] Ibid. Sect. 13. [*v*] Chap. XIV. [*x*] Ibid. Sect. 20. [*y*] Ibid. Sect. 22. [*z*] Chap. XIV. Sect. 9 12, 13, 14.

volution Eſtabliſhment *Schiſmatical*, and in the Year 1704 publiſhed his *Latine* Book entitled *Paræneſis ad exteros de nupero Schiſmate Anglicano* to advertiſe Forreigners thereof. What, you'll ſay, was his Quarrel with the *Revolution* Church of *England*? Was it her Injuries to the late K. *James*? No. Was it her renouncing the Doctrines of Paſſive Obedience and Non-Reſiſtance *on any Pretence whatſoever*? No. Was it the ſcandalous new Prayers ſhe had put into the *Liturgy*? No. All theſe Things, he expreſly tells us p. 3. He, with thoſe of his Principles, made a Shift to bear with; perhaps ſo much the more eaſily that, as the Writer of his *Life* tells us, he had been proclaimed a Rebel for not comeing in and takeing Part with the Forces of the ſaid K. *James* when they endeavoured to keep Poſſeſſion of *Ireland* in the Year 1689. What was it then diſobliged him? Why the Biſhops *Mitre* was touched, and that was of more Conſideration than the Kings Crown. The Nonjuring Biſhops were diſpoſſeſſed; their vacant *Sees*, after much Patience, filled with as good Men as themſelves. That was never to be digeſted, and therefore he declared the Eſtabliſhment a *Schiſm*.

This was a pretty high Flight, and yet he was not at his Pitch. In the Year 1706 He publiſhed his *Epiſtolary Diſcourſe, proveing from the Scriptures and First Fathers, That the Soul is a Principle naturally mortal, wherein is proved, that none have the Power of giveing the Divine immortalizing Spirit, ſince the Apoſtles, but only the* Biſhops. Here was a very New and ſurprizing Scene opened. The *Heathens* that never heard of Chriſt were made happy by it. The worſt they had to fear was, that their Souls ſhould vaniſh into *thin* Air. But then ſad was the Caſe of all *Separatiſts* from the *Epiſcopal* Communion: For though their Souls were neither by Nature Immortal, nor Immortalized by *Epiſcopal* Baptiſm; yet, he found a *Cue* to have them *Immortalized actually by the Pleaſure of God to Puniſhment*. Was ever ſuch horrid Doctrine heard of among Chriſtians? However, that Book, though perhaps the very worſt ever ſaw the Light, had, by accident, one very good Effect. For, ſuch as were before in Danger of being implicitly carried into his Principles by the Fame of his Learning; when they ſaw that he would force even the *Scriptures* and *Fathers* to vouch for the *Natural Mortality* of the Soul, very juſtly preſumed, that his Reaſonings from them in his *other* Books were to be ſuſpected.

'Tis

'Tis now worth the while to see how Mr. *Rhind* refines on this. ' Tis true, *saith he* p. 24. M. *Dodwell seemed* to have given his *Enemies* a *Handle* against him, by the uncouth Thoughts which he vented in his *Book of the Soul*, but this he did in a manner so learned, & so far *above the Comprehension of Ordinary Readers*, that, *allowing* his Opinion to have been Erroneous, yet would not *many* be in *Hazard* of being perverted by it. Withall, I considered that my then Search was not to be employed about that *supposed* singular Opinion of his; for what I was then Desirous to know, was only, whether his Arguments for Episcopacy were forcible or not?

Here is a Text worth the commenting on. Did M. *Dodwell seem* only, did he not really give a *handle* not only to his *Enemies* but to all the World that had any Regard for Religion? But why does M. *Rhind* call it his *Book of the Soul*? Why does he not call it his *Book for Episcopacy*? *Episcopacy* was the Conclusion intended, the Mortality of the Soul only a *Medium* for enforceing it. Why does he say it was writ *above the Comprehension of ordinary Readers*? Did he not write it in *English*? And is not this a tollerable Presumption that he design'd he should be understood? Is not the Doctrine, to wit, the *Mortality of the Soul*, so Plain that every Plowman may understand it. But M. *Rhind* is right: For the Arguments for proveing this Doctrine are *above the Comprehension* not only of *ordinary* Readers but of *extraordinary* too, even of *all* understanding. This I am sure of, that the *Floribility* of the Wills of Dead Souls (*a*), separate Souls receiveing Water Baptism (*b*) and the like, are Notions as much above the Capacities of *Presbyterians* as *Jacob Behmen*'s Lucubrations are. I hope *many* are not *in hazard of being perverted by it*. But M. *Rhind* himself is so unhappy as to be one, for it is not *really* but a *supposed* singular Opinion, he will not positivly say it *is* Erroneous, but *allowing* it to be so, it is not dangerous because of its Obscurity. But how in all the World could he suffer these Words to drop from him, ' That his search was not to be employed about that singular Opinion of M. *Dodwell*'s, but to know whether his Arguments for Episcopacy were forcible or not. Is not the *natural Mortality of the Soul*,

[*a*] Sect. 41. p. 173. [*b*] Sect. 42.

Soul, and its being immortalized by Epiſcopal Baptiſm, or in defect of it, by the *Pleaſure of* God to *Puniſhment*, one of his Arguments for *Epiſcopacy*? What meant Mr. *Rhind* by ſuch a Jugle, thinks he M. *Dodwell*'s Book is not extant, or that all the World is turned quite Senſeleſs and wants Eyes to read it? I cannot think that Mr. *Rhind* himſelf upon a Review will ſay, That he has uſed the *Sincerity* that would become an expireing Soul.

But to go on with the Hiſtory of M. *Dodwell*. As he had proved the *Diſſenters* and *Low*-Church *Schiſmaticks*, ſo the *Nonjuring* High Church *Tories*, who continued the Separation after the Death of the deprived Biſhops, muſt, in their Turn, be declared Schiſmaticks too. For this Purpoſe he publiſhed a Book, the laſt he wrote, entitled, *The Caſe in View, now in Fact, proveing, that the Continuance of a ſeparated Communion without Subſtitutes, in any of the late* invalidly deprived Sees, *ſince the Death of* William Lord Biſhop of Norwich, *is* Schiſmatical. *With an* Appendix *proveing, That our late* invalidly deprived *Fathers had no Right to ſubſtitute Succeſſors, who might legitimate the Separation, after that the* Schiſm *had been concluded by the Deceaſe of the laſt Surviver of thoſe ſame Fathers*. Thus, I think, there were very few in *England*, Epiſcopal or Diſſenter, of High Church or Low Church, that were not, ſucceſſively at leaſt, *Schiſmaticks* by M. *Dodwell*'s Account. Plainly, his Head was turned with immoderate Zeal, and therefore *Schiſm, Schiſm*, was his everlaſting Clack. Mr. *Rhind* indeed has given p. 25 another Character of him. *viz.* 'That he has ſtated the 'Controverſy fairly, that his Authorities are pertinent and juſtly al-'ledged, and that his Deductions from them and *all* his other Rea-'ſonings do proceed in a *Mathematical* Chain. This Character I ſhall, *ad hominem*, allow: For, whenever I ſhall find M. *Dodwell*'s and M. *Rhind*'s Reaſonings quite contrary; which I hope not ſeldom to find in the following Sheets, it will neceſſary follow that Mr. *Rhind* is fully anſwered, a *Mathematical* Chain being more Inviolable than an *Adamantine* one. So much for M. *Dodwell*.

As for M. *Sage*, our *Apologiſt*'s other *Celebrated* Author, all he ſaies of him is, 'And in Truth, *ſaith he* p. 25, 'tis as much as can be 'ſaid of any Man, That he thought he purſued the Argument in 'the ſame Manner with M. *Dodwell* and improved upon it.

Of

Of this Character the *Panegyrical* Part is Hyperbolical, the *Hiſtorical* Part falſe. Firſt, I ſay, the *Panegyrical* Part viz. *That it is as much as can be ſaid of any Man*, is Hyperbolical. No Man that is not blindly Partial will make him a Standard. 'Tis true he was Maſter of ſeveral good Qualities, of a good Capacity and great Application; but the *Revolution* had ſoured his Temper, which carried him out often to tranſgreſs the Rules of Religion as well as Decency; witneſs his *Fundamental Charter of Presbytry*, particularly his long *Preface* prefixed to it, upon the Account of which, I acknowledge, he deſerves the Character of an *Incomparable* Author: For, he has therein treated his Adverſary after a Faſhion, which, to ſay no worſe of it, will not be eaſily paralleled. And which makes it ſo much the more intolerable is, that he did it upon ſome Points of Hiſtory, in which his own Friends (*c*) have at laſt acknowledged he was miſtaken. And how Falſe and Weak his *Hiſtorical* Argueings were in the ſaid *Charter* upon the Uſage of the *Engliſh* Liturgy in *Scotland* has been ſufficiently ſhown in the *Country-man's Letter to the Curat* on that Subject.

'Tis true there is lately publiſhed a *Vindication of the Fundamental Charter* in Oppoſition to the ſaid *Letter*. But I hope, upon compareing the two, The *Vindication* will appear to be a very harmleſs Piece: For 1. Who is likely ever to be moved by an Author that tells, as that *Vindicator* does p. 165, 'That it is not Sufficient Proof, that a Thing is not, becauſe the Hiſtorians are ſilent about it, no, not ſuppoſe they ſhould all contradict it. Has that Gentleman his Hiſtory by Inſpiration? No, but he would have us to Judge by Hiſtories yet to be written, p. 166. p. 13. 2ly, Who will be moved by his Argueings on *Buchanan*, when, notwithſtanding that *Buchanan* is acknowledged to be the *ſole* Relater of what he Argues for, he yet ſaies, 'That *Buchanan* was doating when he wrote his Hiſtory, if it came from his Hands, as we have it in all the Editions hitherto publiſhed p. 165. 3ly, Who that profeſſes, as the *Vindicator* does p. 9. to write *with all poſſible Candour* would ſay with him p. 164. that *Buchanan* Contradicts himſelf about *Arthur's Oven*, when no Man ever dealt more candidly than

(*c*) Vindication of the Fundamental Charter. p. 79.

than *Buchanan* has done in that Matter, even though it was of no Consequence. He begins the *Civil* History of his Nation at the *fourth* Book; there, in the Reign of K. *Donald* I. He saies, 'That 'Work now called *Arthur's Oven*, some have falsly related to have 'been the Temple of *Claudius Cæsar*. We, so far as we can guess, be- 'lieve it to have been the Temple of *Terminus*. You see he makes but a Guess of it. To the *Civil* History of his Nation he thought fit to prefix the *Geography* of it and an Account of its *Antiquity*; and there, like a most Candid Soul, he retracts his former *Guess* upon better Information, and in the *first* Book delivers himself thus. 'I indeed was once induced by a Conjecture *(by this it ap-* 'pears, *that the* Civil *History was written before the* Geographical *Part*) 'to believe it to have been the Temple of *Terminus*, which (we 'have learned) used to be built Round and open above: 'But *then he tells*, that he was informed by creditable Persons That 'there were several other Buildings of the same Form in other 'Places of the Nation. This, *saith he*, forced me to suspend my 'Opinion----. Say now, good Reader, is there any *Doating* here in *Buchanan*, when he is so watchfull even over his Escapes in *Guessings*? Is there any contradiction here? Did not *Augustine* write *two* full Books of *Retractions*, and one of them too of what he wrote when he was a Bishop? And does not every Man applaud his Ingenuity for doing so? Nay, has not M. *Dodwell* himself retract- ed (*d*) even in point of History? And yet who blames him for it? 4*thly*, Who, to avoid the Force of Dr. *Burnet* now Bishop of *Sarum* his Testimony from the Pulpit before the House of *Commons*, concerning what he had seen, and Papers he had had in his Hands, would put off the Matter by telling, as the *Vindicator* does p. 36, that *the Bishop is not Infallible, and that all he preached in* 1688 *was not Gospel*, and *that he sometimes preached* Extempore? Was not this a most Bitter Way of giveing him the Lye, and, which makes the Treatment still the more Rude, he at the same Time declares, *that it were uncivil and uncharitable in him to Question the* Doctor's *Candour and Veracity*. Is this the grave *Vindicator*! Is the World so far lost, as to take *Slyness* for *Sincerity*, and *Affectation* for

[*d*] *Paranes.* Sect. 15. p. 61.

Gravity? 5*thly*, Who that reads the Dr's *Sermon*, knows his Character, or ever heard of his Concernment in the Project of *Comprehenſion* will alledge his Words to be Capable of any other *Entendre* than the *Country-man* has put on them? 6*thly*, Who would deny that the Dr's Teſtimony bears, 'That the Ceremonies 'miſs'd narrowly of being thrown out by an *Act* of the *Convoca-* 'tion, *when* it was carried by the greateſt Number of the Voices 'of the Members that were preſent in the *lower Houſe* that they 'ſhould be laid aſide; And when the Biſhops (who make the upper Houſe) were the ſame Way affected, *the* Queen's *Stifneſs in maintaining them*, ſaith the Dr, *not flowing from their Counſels, but from diſguiſed Papiſts*; Will any Man, that deſigns not to trifle, deny that this was a *narrow Miſs*? But the *Vindicator* overlooked the *Biſhops* in the Dr's Teſtimony. 7*thly*, The Author of the *Charter* had affirmed that our Country-man *Aleſs* was a Member of the *Engliſh* Convocation. The Country-man had proved beyond Contradiction that *Aleſs* was not a Member. What ſaies the *Vindicator* to this? It was only *an Impropriety of Speech* in the *Acurate* Author. Every Man ought to deſpair, after ſuch an Anſwer, to convince the *Vindicator* that it is Light at mid-day. But the Anſwer is indeed as ſolid, as the Epithet of *Acurate* is Judiciouſly choſen in that *P*lace.

But I acknowledge all this is a Digreſſion from M. *Rhind*'s Book. I have only adduced theſe Inſtances to convince the Reader that if the *Country-man*, who is my good Friend and next Neighbour, don't give himſelf the Trouble of makeing any *Return* to the ſaid *Vindication*, 'tis plain it is, becauſe it *needs* none. The reading over his *Letter* once more after the *Vendication* being at once an Eaſie and Sufficient Anſwer to it. I return then to Mr. *Rhind*.

In the ſecond Place, his *hiſtorical* Part of M. *Sage*'s Character *viz.* *that he has purſued the Argument in the ſame Manner with M.* Dodwell, is falſe. M. *Dodwell* in all his Books upon Church Government (e) aſſerts the Biſhop's *Sole* Power, and though he is content to give a *Conſultory* Power to the *Presbyters*, which every Chriſtian Man and

(e) See Diſſert. *Cypr.* Numb. 13, 14, 15. *Parænes.* Sect. 37, Præmonitiones to the Epiſtolary diſcourſe p. 49, &c.

and Woman has, it being lawfull to all or any of the People to ſay to *Archippus*, *Take heed to the Miniſtry*----, yet he peremptorly refuſes them a *Decretory* Power. M. *Sage* on the other Hand not only denies the ſaid *Sole* Power, but applys himſelf in his *Vindication of the Principles of the Cyprianick Age* to diſprove the Biſhops claiming of it. Was this *to purſue the Argument after the ſame Manner*? That Excellent Perſon M. JAMESON wrote His *Cyprianus Iſotimus* in Anſwer to the ſaid *Vindication*. And anſwer it he did beyond Poſſibility of Reply. M. *Sage* Himſelf was abundantly Senſible of this, He lived half a *Dozen* Years after M. *Jameſon*'s Book was Publiſhed, but never eſſayed to make a Return. He could not but ſee how he had miſtaken his Meaſures and prejudged the Cauſe. And therefore as he *could* not with any ground of Reaſon, ſo he *would* not, out of Love to the Cauſe, inſiſt. And I doubt not but it was very heavy to his Spirit to Survive the Reputation of his principal Book; and to think that he ſhould have waſted the precious Lamp of Life in ſo voluminous a Work, for proving that Biſhops did not claim a *Sole* Power, when not only his learned Adverſary had proved, beyond Contradiction, that they did ſo, but the moſt learned of his own Party allowed, that it was Their *Right* to claim it. So much for Mr. *Rhind*'s Narrative.

CHAP. II.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *first Reason for Separating from the* Presbyterian *Party* viz *That They are* Schismaticks *in Point of* Government, *is Examined. From* P. 29. *to* P. 119.

FOR Justifieing this Reason of *Separation* Mr. *Rhind* uses the following Method. First. He lays down two *Principles* from which he subsumes some *Corollaries*. 2dly, He states the Debate, and 3dly advances his Arguments.

SECT. I.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Principles and Corollaries* P. 29, *are examined.*

HIS *two Principles* are. I' That the Church is but one. II That 'it is a Society distinct from and Independent upon the 'State.

From the first of these *Principles* he inferrs these two Corollaries. 'I 'That the ordinary Means of Salvation are confined to the Church. 'II. That whoever are without (but more especially they who 'separate from its Communion) are out of the ordinary Way of 'Salvation.

From

From the Second of these *Principles* he inferrs these three *Corollaries*. 'I That the Church has distinct Laws, and a Government and 'Governours of its own which can serve all the Purposes of the 'Society. II That that which does properly denominate one a 'Member of the Church is the Acknowledgement of its Laws 'and Government, and a Submission to the Authority of its Go-'vernours: Nor is the owning any one of those enough without 'the other. III. That the Contempt either of its Laws or Lawfull 'Governours, requiring no Terms of Communion that are truly 'sinfull, justly deprives one of the Priviledges of this as well as any 'other Society.

From all this he concludes p 30. 31. 'That that Society which 'is not only Defective with respect to that Form of Govern-'ment that obtain'd in the Days of Christ and his Apostles and down-'wards (which is undoubtedly the Rightfull one) but does like-'wise disown and oppose those who govern after that Manner, is '*without* the Church by the *third* Corollary, and consequently out of 'the ordinary Road to Heaven according to the *Second* Corollary from 'the *first* Principle. And that the Presbyterians are thus Defective in, and disown and oppose that Government, he is, after stateing the Debate, to make good by Arguments.

This is his Scheme, but notwithstanding its *Mathematical* Face; as it will not please the *Presbyterians*, so yet far less the Church of *England* which he has joined.

First, it will not please the *Presbyterians*, as he too confidently presumes. For, tho' they willingly admitt his *first* Principle, *That the Church is but one*, and do firmly believe that there is but *one* Government by *Divine Right* viz. the *Presbyterian*, and zealously wish that it might obtain all the World over; yet by no Means will they assert that such as either oppose or want that Government are *without* the Church. The Government of many of the *Protestant* Churches in *Germany* is Superintendency, that of *New England* Independency, that of *Old England* Prelacy. The *Presbyterians* believe, They are each of them in an Error, the *last* especially in a Hugely great one; And yet they believe them all to be within the Church and capable of Salvation, if they are otherwise good Christians; And that, as an *English* Poet has it somewhere,

The

The God that pardons Sin will pardon Errors too.

They own the Road to Heaven is narrow, yet they don't believe it so narrow, but that they can charitably hope that one Company may walk to it with a *Presbyterian* Minister on their Head; and another (tho' not in so straight a Line) with a *Bishop* on theirs. 'Tis told of Mr. *Rhind* (and he allows us p. 9. to represent him to have been a *Presbyterian of the most rigid Kind*) that while he was studying Theology at *Edinburgh* among the *Presbyterians*, he made it a Question in a Society of his Fellow Students, Whether an *Episcopal* Minister dying in that Opinion cou'd be saved? I suppose he was the first *Presbyterian* ever started the Question, and possibly may be the last. But some Peoples Brains are figured for Bigotry, on whatever Side they are. Whether it be by *Nature* or *Accident* They are so, I referr it to such as have Skill in the *Animal Oeconomy*.

Secondly, I say Mr. *Rhind*'s Scheme will yet far less please the Church of *England* which he has joined; Which I shall make good in *two* particulars; when once I have premised, That by the Church of *England* I do not mean only this or the other particular *Doctor*, but that I mean her *Articles*, *Homilies*, *Liturgy*, *Canons* and such other publick *Formula's*.

First. Tho' the Church of *England* thinks *Prelacy* the best Government, yet she is very far from *unchurching* those that want it. In her *Nineteenth Article* she defines the *visible Church* of Christ to be 'a Congregation of faithfull Men, in the which the pure Word of God is 'preached, and the Sacraments be duely administred according 'to Christ's Ordinance, in all those things that of Necessity are requisite to the same? In her *twenty third* Article She declares, 'That 'those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent which be chosen 'and called to this Work by Men who have publick Authority given to them, in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into 'the Lord's Vineyard? In neither of these *Articles*, tho' they were the only Place for doing it, is any one particular Form of Church-Government declared Necessary. Nay, the *Articles* are conceived in such general Words on Purpose, *that they might not be thought to exclude other Churches that differ from them in point of Government*. So saies the

the Bishop of *Sarum* (*f*) whose Sufficiency to understand the Intent of the *Articles* was never doubted, and whose Concern for the Episcopal Cause in Reason cannot. 'And, *adds he*, whatever some 'hotter Spirits have thought of this, since that Time; Yet we are 'very sure, that not only those who penned the *Articles*, but the Bo-'dy of this Church for above half an Age after, did notwithstand-'ing those Irregularities, acknowledge the foreign Churches so 'constituted, to be true Churches as to all the Essentials of a Church. And p. 260. *Neither our Reformers nor their Successors for near eighty Years after those* Articles *were published, did ever question the Constitution of such Churches.* And the Noble Historian *Clarendon* † who was abundantly zealous for the Church, represents it as a false Step in the Government of K. *Charles* I that the *English* Ambassadour with his Retinue separated from the Protestant Church at *Charenton* contrary to former usage. Yet further, the Church of *England* was powerfully attaqued by the *Romanists* in the Days of the late K. *James*; and upon the very same Scheme too which Mr. *Rhind* hath advanced viz. Metaphysical Inferences from the Unity of the Church; from which they would needs conclude her to be *Schismatical*. The *English* Divines never made a more noble Appearance than on that Occasion. They engaged with the *Romanists* and defeat them to the Conviction of all the World, but then it was by Reasonings which quite overturn Mr. *Rhind's* Scheme. Dr. *Sherlock* first enters the Field, and with open Mouth declares (*g*) against the Unchurching Doctrine for the want of *Episcopal* Government. 'I am sure, *saith he*, that is not a safe 'Communion where there is not a Succession of Apostolical Do-'ctrine; but whether the Want of a Succession of Bishops, will in 'all Cases unchurch, will admit of a greater Dispute: I am 'sure a true Faith in Christ, with a true Gospel Conversation, 'will save Men; And some learned *Romanists* defend that old 'Definition of the Church, That it is *Cœtus Fidelium*, the Com-'pany of the Faithfull, and will not admit Bishops or Pastors into 'the Definition of a Church. Thus he. Dr. *Clagget* succeeds him, and goes yet more roundly to Work. He affirms indeed (*h*) as we

[*f*] Expos. Art. XIII. p. 259. † Hist. Rebell. [*g*] Vindication of the Discourse concern. the Notes of the Church p. 53. [*h*] Upon Bellarmin's VIIth Note of the Church.

we do, the Church to be *one* in many Reſpects viz. of *Head*, *Faith*, *Sacraments*, *Service* and *Government* too. But expreſly denys *that any of theſe Kinds and Inſtances of* Unity *are neceſſary to the Being of a Church, except theſe of one Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm.* And further aſſerts, 'that from the Apoſtles Times till the Council of *Trent*, the conſtant 'Univerſal Doctrine concerning the Church was this, That it is the '*Society of the Faithfull*, without ever inſerting into the Definition 'of it any Thing relating to its being united to the Pope, or ANY 'OTHER BISHOP as to a viſible Head.' To both theſe you may add Mr. *Stillingfleet* afterwards Biſhop of *Worceſter*, who has proved *(i)* beyond Contradiction that the main Bulk of the Ancient Biſhops and Divines of the Church of *England*, from the firſt Dawning of the *Reformation* almoſt down to *Laud*, have expreſly declared againſt the Neceſſity of *Epiſcopal* Government, and maintained the Mutability of Church Government according to the Will of the Prince or Circumſtances of the Kingdom; and herein they were *againſt* Mr. *Rhind* and his Fellows. And that they have alſo acknowledged the Scripture Identity of Biſhop and Presbyter, aſſerting the *Names* to be interchangeable and the *Office* the ſame. And herein they were *for* the Presbyterians.

Secondly. This is not the only Quarrell the Church of *England* has againſt Mr. *Rhind*'s Scheme. No one wonders to find the *Presbyterians* aſſerting the *Intrinſick Power* of the Church. They ſtill claimed it, have been always wreſtling for it, to be ſure they never renounced it; but it certainly very ill becomes one who has joined the Church of *England* to lay it down for a Principle, as he has done, *that the Church is independent of the State.* If ſo, what then means the 21 *Article* which declares, 'that General Councils may not be 'gathered together without the Commandment and Will of Princes? Are not theſe neceſſary for ſerving the Purpoſes of the Society? The *Church independent of the State!* What then means the 37 *Article* which declares 'the Queen's Majeſty to have the Chief Power and 'Government of all Eſtates whether Eccleſiaſtical or Civil and in all 'Cauſes? *The Church independent of the State!* What then means the firſt *Canon* 1640 concerning the Regal Power, wherein the King's Supremacy

[*i*] Irenic. Part II Chap. VIII.

premacy over the Eccleſiaſtical State and in Cauſes Eccleſiaſtical is not only aſſerted but argued for: And the Government of the Church declared to belong *in Chief* unto Kings, and that the Power to call and diſſolve Councils both National and Provincial is the *true Right* of all Chriſtian Kings within their own Realms and Territories, and that when in the firſt Times of Chriſt's Church Prelats uſed this Power, it was therefore only becauſe in thoſe Days They had no Chriſtian Kings. *The Church Independent of the State*! What then means the firſt *Canon* 1603 the very *Rubrick* whereof is, *The King's Supremacy over the Church of England in Cauſes Eccleſiaſtical to be maintain'd! The Church Independent of the State!* What then meant the Biſhop of *Norwich* Anno 1709 in his *Viſitation Charge* to ſpend a good Part of his Diſcourſe and a large *Appendix* in cautioning his Clergy againſt that Principle? Say now, good Reader, if Mr. *Rhind* has not been competently furniſhed with Aſſurance when he declared p, 29 His Principles and Corollaries *to be Truths ſo evident, that he thought it needleſs to enlarge on them.* Had he intended only a Diſpute againſt the *Presbyterians* he might indeed have aſſumed the *Independency of the Church* for a *Principle*: But when he was to tell the World what ſatisfied his own Conſcience, and determin'd him to go over to the Church of *England*, which in the moſt ſolemn Manner has renounced that Principle, the inſiſting on it was one of the greateſt Inconſiſtencies a Man could be guilty of.

I ſhall conclude this Diſcourſe upon his Scheme with one *Obſervation.* Mr. *Rhind* would needs have the *Presbyterians* to be *Schiſmaticks*, and thence inferrs That they are *without* the Church. But this is horridly falſe Reaſoning: For, I affirm That, if they are *Schiſmaticks*, then it will follow that they are *within* the Church. I know this will be ſurprizing at firſt to ſome Readers, yet it is certainly true. The *Romaniſts*, in the Days of the late K. *James*, reaſoned, exactly after the ſame Manner with Mr. *Rhind*, againſt the Church of *England*: But that great Author before mentioned, I mean Dr. *Sherlock* demonſtrates that pretended Reaſoning to be flat Nonſenſe, and his Words will abundantly clear my Aſſertion.

'A *Schiſmatical* Church, *ſaith he*, (*k*) ſignifies a Church too, and 'how they are a Church without belonging to the *one* Church, 'when there is but *one* Church, is ſomewhat Myſterious. And 'therefore *Schiſm* is not tearing off a Part of the Church, but 'one Part dividing from the other in external Communion, which 'ſuppoſes that both Parts ſtill belong to the ſame Church, or elſe 'the Church is not divided. For *Apoſtacy* and *Schiſm* are two 'different Things; *Apoſtates* ceaſe to be of the Church, *Schiſmaticks* 'are of the Church ſtill, though they diſturb the Peace of the 'Church and divide the external Communion of it---. Does St. '*Paul*, who reproves the *Corinthians* for their Schiſms, ſhut them 'out of the Church for them too? Does He deny them to belong 'to the Church, when He directs His Epiſtle *to the Church of God* 'at Corinth. Thus he. So very looſly knit is Mr. *Rhind*'s Scheme, that the one Part of it deſtroys the other. And if he can prove the Presbyterians *Schiſmaticks*, *eo ipſo* it will follow, that they are not *without* the Church. Dr. *Sherlock*'s Reaſoning is *Plain*, Strong, palpable Senſe, againſt which Mr. *Dodwell*'s uſual Stile, though founded upon ſome looſe expreſſions of the *Fathers*, will never bear out Mr. *Rhind*. Nor is Mr. *Rhind* altogether a Looſer by this Obſerve: For whereas he hints in his *Preface*, that he has been upbraided with *Apoſtacy* by ſome; though I am as well aſſur'd he is a *Schiſmatick*, as I am, that there is ſuch a Sin as *Schiſm*; yet, upon the former Reaſoning, he ought not to be called an *Apoſtate*, till he declare himſelf a little more Explicitly. I hope then he will digeſt the Obſervation the more eaſily, that what he looſes by it in Argument, he ſaves in Character.

SECT.

(*k*) Ubi ſupra p. 27. 28.

SECT. II.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *State of the Debate betwixt the* Presbyterians *and* Episcopalians, P. 31, 32. *is Examined.*

THE Stateing of a Debate aright is always a principal Point in Controversy. Take it in Mr. *Rhind*'s own Words. 'It is sufficient to answer my Design in this short *Apology*, if I can 'prove that the Government of the Church, from the Beginning, 'was managed by *Officers* of different Orders, and such as acted 'in Capacities, superior the one to the other; among whom there 'were neither Ruling Elders, nor Deacons, such as the *Presbyte-*'*rians* have. This, *saith he*, is all that the Episcopal Writers 'plead for. And therefore he *thinks it needless to determine more explicitly, what are the distinguishing Characteristicks of the several Officers, or to fix the Bounds of their Respective Powers.* Thus he. Now let us Remark a little upon it.

I. Why does he State the Debate upon a Subordination of *Officers*? Was there ever Presbyterian denied, that there should be a Subordination among the *Officers* as well as *Judicatories* of the Church? Do not they own *Christ* to be the Chief Sheepherd, the absolute King and Monarch of the Church? Don't They own *Presbyteries* to be under him, *Deacons* under both? Is not here a fair Subordination of *Officers*? If he had stated the Debate upon a Subordination or Imparity of *Pastors* or *Ministers*, takeing these Words in their Current Ecclesiastical Sense, it had been to the Purpose; but to State it upon a Subordination or Imparity of *Rulers* or *Officers* was to lay a Foundation to himself for Chicane.

Possibly he may think to ward off this Remark by what he has

added, *That among these Subordinate Officers, there were neither Ruling Elders nor Deacons such as the* Presbyterians *have.* This, I acknowledge, when proved, will be a considerable Point gained against the *Presbyterians.* But then 1mo. Why has he not restricted himself to the Proof of this? For, in all his *State of the Debate*, there is not one Syllable more to the Purpose; and yet of the 90 *Pages* he has spent in the Prosecution of it, he has employed only *five* of them, and these two only by the by, against the *Ruling Elders* and *Deacons*. With what Success we shall afterward hear. 2do. When he has proved, which yet I despair of finding done, *that among these Subordinate Officers, there were neither Ruling Elders nor Deacons such as the* Presbyterians *have*, it will indeed follow that the *Presbyterians*, are mistaken in the Characters and Functions of their Subordinate *Officers*. But by no means will it follow That they are against a Subordination of *Officers*. On the Contrary, Mr. *Rhind*'s Disputing against the Presbyterian *Ruling Elders* and *Deacons* proves irrefragably, that they are *for* a Subordination of *Officers*. I desire every Reader of Mr. *Rhind*'s Book to attend carefully to this, and they will see there is no more needfull for discovering the Uselessness of all his Arguments for a Subordination of *Officers*, the *Presbyterians* being as much for it as the *Prelatists* are; and that his *latter* Part of the Debate is a most effectual Confutation of the *former*.

II. Why does he say, That a Subordination of *Officers*, without such *Ruling Elders* and *Deacons as the* Presbyterians have, *is upon the Main* all *that the* Episcopal *Writers plead for?* Of all Things in the World unsincere Dealing is the most Odious. Certainly he has taken it for a Principle, That none who was to read his Book had ever read the *Episcopal* Writers, or would ever be Capable of reading them. Is he yet to learn, That the *sole* Power is pleaded for by them? Haveing read so many Books of that Side, can his Judgement be so weak as not to have discerned, or his Memory so frail as to have forgot, that all the Elevations of an absolute Monarch accountable to God only are pleaded for by them? If so, Care shall be taken ere I have done to clear up his Discernment and refresh his Memory. Does he Imagine that a *Subordination* and *sole* Power are all one? Or will a meer *Subordination* without

out Presbyterian *Elders* or *Deacons* pleaſe him? If ſo, he is too well natured: For, alas, it will not pleaſe his Brethren. To Humour him a little, I ſhall ſuppoſe the *Presbyterians* content to accept of Conſtant Moderators for *Term of Life*, and that ſuch Moderators have the *Preſidency* in all their Aſſemblies: Bnt would that ſave them from the Guilt of *Schiſm*? Mr. *Dodwell* has expreſly ſaid it will not. Hear him (*l*). 'This (*a Principle of Unity*) none of 'our Modern Sects, execept the Presbyterians, can ſo much as 'offer at. None of them (*the other Modern Sects*) have any ſingle 'Miniſter, who by their Principles can pretend to Superiority over 'his Brethren. And all that they (*the Presbyterians*) can pre-'tend is a Moderator over their Claſſes, either for a certain Time 'or at the utmoſt for Term of Life. Yet even that is not Suf-'ficient for a Principal of Unity. Seeing the Sacrifices are they 'which are the Cement of this Unity, it muſt be a Preſidency, 'not in their Aſſemblies only but their Sacrifices, which can en-'title to a Principle of it.' Thus M. *Dodwell*. And what now would it ſignifie though Presbyterians ſhould grant all that Subordination which Mr. *Rhind* pleads for, when notwithſtanding, They muſt ſtill remain *Schiſmaticks* by M. *Dodwell*'s Verdict.

III. Why did he *think it needleſs to determine more explicitly the ſeveral Characteriſticks of the ſeveral* Officers *and to fix the Bounds of their Reſpective Powers*? About what, I pray, is all the Controverſy betwixt *Prelatiſts* and *Presbyterians*? Is it about the *Title* of *Biſhop*? 'Tis yielded on both Hands to be a Scriptural one. Is it whether there *ſhould* be *Biſhops* in the Church? The *Presbyterian* was never yet created who denied it. Is it that theſe *Biſhops* ſhould have *Officers* ſubordinate to them? The *Presbyterians* loudly aſſert it. Is it not then the Controverſy about *the Characteriſticks and Powers of Biſhops*, wherein the Choak lyes? And yet Mr. *Rhind* thinks it *needleſs to determine them more explicitly*. If ſo, tis very plain he ſhould have thought it *needleſs* to have written his Book. If the *Prelatiſts* can pove, that *Biſhops* by *Divine Right* ſhould be *abſolute Monarchs*; or, to come lower, that they ſhould have a *Negative* Voice ſinple or even Reciprocal; If they can prove, that by *Divine Right* they

(*l*) Of Prieſthood. Chap. XIII. Sect. 13. p. 396, 6.

they have the *ſole* Power of *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction* or either of them. If they can prove, that by *Divine Right* they ſhould have ſome *Hundreds* or even *Scores* of Congregations under their Inſpection; *Presbyterians* are heartily content to yield the Cauſe, and to accept of *Biſhops* with all theſe Powers or *ſo many* of them as they ſhall prove of *Divine Right* to belong to them. On the other Hand, if the *Prelatiſts* are content with *Biſhops* that are neither *abſolute Monarchs*, nor have a *Negative* Voice, nor *ſole* Power, nor a *greater* Charge than they can perſonally inſpect, that is, preach and diſpenſe the Sacraments to, with the Aſſiſtance of *Elders* to overſee the Manners of the People, (and of *Deacons* to take Care of the *Poor*) and that Diſcipline may be duly exerciſed; the *Presbyterians* offer to prove that they have ſuch *Biſhops* already, or are content to take them where they have not. Is it poſſible fairer Conditions can be either demanded or offered? Why then did Mr. *Rhind* decline to explain himſelf? The Reaſon is obvious, He deſigned to harangue a while, and diſputing would have marred the Cadency of his Periods.

IV. Suppoſing Mr. *Rhind*'s State of the Debate had been more Diſtinct than it is, it would anſwer only the one Half of his Undertaking in the *Title Page*. For tho' it might be a Reaſon for *His ſeparating from the Presbyterians*, yet it would be none for *His embracing the Communion of the Church* according to his preſent Practice, unleſs he had proved that the Subordination of Officers in the Church of *England* Conſtitution, into which he is gone, were of *Divine* Inſtitution; Which he has not ſo much as attempted to prove, I add nor can be proved. For, that *Primats* or *Arch Biſhops* haveing a Power over and being *Ordinaries* to the other *Biſhops*, that *Biſhops* exerceing a *Sole* Power or even a *Negative* Voice, that *Presbyters* ſerving as the Biſhop's *Delegates* without Power of *Ordination* or *Jurisdiction*, that *Preaching Deacons* veſted with a Power of Baptizing, but deprived of all Manadgement of the Churches Stock or Care of the Poor, which was the Original Deſign of Their Office; that, I ſay, all or *any* of theſe Officers conſidered under theſe peculiar Characters, are the Creatures of God, or of *Divine* Inſtitution, I poſitivly deny, and want to be directed to any Author that ha proven it.

So much for Mr. *Rhind*'s Way of ſtateing the Debate: And, I be-

lie'e,

lieve, 'tis obvious to every Body, that thereby he has projected for his own Ease rather than the Reader's Conviction. For, let one, in peruseing his Book, dash out the Word *Officers* or *Rulers*, an Imparity or Subordination among which the *Presbyterians* grant, and substitute in Place thereof the Word *Pastors* or *Ministers*, a Parity among whom was his Business to disprove; and it will presently appear that several of his Arguments are Just as much to the Purpose, as an *Ode* of *Horace* would have been.

But there is no need of running into Niceties in this Matter. Every Body has a tolerable Notion in the Gross what is meant by *Prelacy* and *Presbytry*. If Mr. *Rhind*'s Arguments prove, that the *latter* is a *Schismatical* kind of Government, the *former* that which *should* obtain in the Church, I shall grant he has gained his Point. If they prove not that, 'tis nothing to us what else they prove. And whether they do so or not, I am now to apply my Self to try.

SECT. III.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Arguments for* Prelacy *are summed up.*

HE has cast his Arguments into the Form of a *Harangue*; but so far as I can distinguish them they amount to the Number of *Nine*. The three first of which are calculate to *argue* that Prelacy *should* have been instituted; the six latter to *prove* that it actually *was* instituted.

First That it was necessary that Prelacy *should* be instituted, he argues

I. From

I. From the Nature of the Thing which made it Indiſpenſibly neceſſary in it ſelf. A Monarchical or Subordinate Form being able to anſwer the Ends of Government better than the Contrary.

II. From the Form of Government in the *Jewiſh* Church, ſeeing God muſt be uniform in his Actings.

III. From the Form the Rules of political Prudence, ſeeing a levelling Form of Government would have been diſtaſtfull both to the *Jews* and *Romans*, as being Oppoſite to the Hierarchy of the former, and Monarchy of the latter.

Secondly, That it actually *was* inſtituted, he attempts to prove.

I. From its obtaining in the Days of Chriſt, as appears from the Subordination of the LXX to the *Twelve*.

II. From its being continued in the Days of the Apoſtles, as appears from the Hiſtory of their *Acts*, and their *Epiſtles*, and a Succeſſion in the Apoſtolate.

III. From the Epiſcopacy of *Timothy* and *Titus*.

IV. From the Apocalyptick Angels.

V. From Teſtimonies of Antiquity.

VI. From the Impoſſibility of its Obtaining ſo early and univerſally, if it had not been of Divine Inſtitution.

All theſe (beſides what he has advanced againſt the Presbyterian *Ruling Elders* and *Deacons*) I ſhall examine in Order.

SECT. IV.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Arguings for proveing, that it was Neceſſary that the Prelatick Form of Government* ſhould *have been at firſt Inſtituted, is Examined. From* P. 32. *to* P. 49.

I Have juſt now obſerved that he attempts this by *three* Arguments, which I ſhall examine in ſo many *Articles*. Let me only once

once more advertise the Reader, that Mr. *Rhind*'s expressing himself in this Controversy by a *Subordinate* Form of Government on the one Hand, and a *levelling* Form of Government on the other, with such like Phrases, is a very Ridiculous as well as unjust Stile: For, the *Presbyterians* are *against* a *Levelling*, they are *for* a *Subordinate* Form of Government, yea, they are for a *Monarchical* Form of Government, understanding our Lord to be that Monarch; as Mr. *Rhind* Himself does p. 49. Though then Mr. *Rhind* found it necessary for amusing his Reader and filling his *Pages* to use such Forms of Speaking as a *Monarchical* or *Subordinate*, a *Republican* or *Levelling* Form of Government; yet I must either neglect his Arguments altogether, as signifieing nothing in this Controversy, or else I must plainly understand by these and the like Phrases *Prelacy* or *Presbytry* respectively, as common Usage has fixed the Notion of them in this Controversy. This premised I now proceed.

ARTICLE I.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Argument, for the* Indispensible *Necessity of Instituting* Prelacy, *from the* Nature of the Thing *is examined. From* P. 32. *to* P. 39.

THE Summ of his Argument is this. God could not but institute the *Best* Form of Government for his Church. A Government of a Monarchical or Subordinate Form is *such*, that is, it can answer the Designs of Society better than *any* other. There-

fore the Church *ought* to have that Form of Government, that is to say, *Prelacy*. Now let us consider this, and

I. I affirm this Way of Arguing labours under *three* very considerable Infirmities. *First*. It is not *Modest*. *Secondly*. not *secure*. *Thirdly*. Suppose it were both; yet, as he has laid it, it is quite *Impertinent*, and does not in the least affect the *Presbyterians*.

First. It is not *Modest*. Does it become the Creature to prescribe to God? Is it sufferable that one should talk at Mr. *Rhind*'s Rate, That such a Form of Government, abstracting from and antecedently to the *Divine* Establishment, *OUGHT* to be, *MUST* be, is *indispensibly Necessary* in it self, that *it does not look like God* that it should be otherwise, all which are his Phrases? Is not this to set Bounds to God's Wisdom and Will? I must needs read a Lecture to Mr. *Rhind* from the judicious *Hooker* (*m*) to teach him more Reverence towards God. ' As for those *marvellous* Discourses, whereby they *adventure* to argue that God *must* needs ' have done the Thing which they *imagine* was to be done, I must ' confess, I have *often wondred* at their *exceeding* Boldness ' herein. When the Question is, whether God have delivered in Scripture (as they affirm he hath) a compleat particular, *immutable* Form of Church Polity; why take they that ' other both *presumptuous* and *superfluous* Labour to prove He *should* ' have done it, there being *no* Way in this Case to prove the ' Deed of God, saveing *only* by produceing that Evidence where- ' in he hath done it.---- When we do otherwise, surely we *exceed* ' our Bounds; who and where we are we forget. And there- ' fore needfull it is that our *Pride* in such Cases be controuled, ' and our Disputes beaten back with those Demands of the Bless- ' sed Apostle, *How unsearchable are his Judgments, and his Ways past* ' *finding out*? *Who hath known the Mind of the Lord, or who was his* ' *Counsellor*?---- In Matters which concern the Actions of God ' the *most* dutifull Way on our Part is to search what God *hath* ' done and with Meekness to admire that, rather than to Dispute ' what he in Congruity of Reason *ought* to do. I'm sure it is Mr. *Rhind*'s Duty to chew the Cud a while on this.

Secondly. It is not *Secure*. For, Circumstances may make that *best*

[*m*] Eccles. Polit. B. III. Sect. XI. p. 154. 155.

best in one Case, which would not be so in another. Hear M. *Dodwell* (*n*) who will clear the Matter. 'The Way of Arguing 'from the *actual Establishments* of *God*, as it is much more *Modest*, 'so it is also much more *Secure* for finding out the *Right* of *Go-* 'vernment than any *Conjectures* we can make from the *Reason* of 'the Thing. It is certainly the most becoming Course for a *Mo-* 'dest *Christian* in all Things to acquiesce in *God's Judgment*, how 'great Evidence soever there might seem for differing from it.--- 'The *Reasons* from the *Nature* of *Government* in *General*, and pe- 'culiarly of *Government* as *Ecclesiastical*, are not proper to any *one* 'Age. But for bringing these Reasonings down to determine the 'Rights of any *particular Government*, many particular *Matters* of 'Fact are requisite to be known. Thus he.

Thirdly. His Argument, as he has laid it is quite *Impertinent*, and does not in the least affect the *Presbyterians*: For he adduces it to prove that there should be a Subordination of *Officers* in the Church, which the *Presbyterians* are for, as well as he.

II. Supposeing his Argument were otherwise tolerable, How does he prove that a *Monarchical* or *Subordinate* Form of Government is the *best*? Why, waveing *the many Arguments of several learned Authors* he will needs advance *three* of his own. The first is taken from the *British Monarchy*. The second from the *Principles*. The third from the *Practices* of the *Presbyterians* Themselves.

The first from the *British Monarchy* stands thus. All the Subjects of *Britain* must own Monarchy to be the best Form of Government for the *State*; and therefore he sees no Reason from *the Nature of the Thing* why it should not be reckoned such for the *Church* also. Nay that *it looks not like God* it should be otherwise p. 33. But this is as unhappy an Argument as Mr. *Rhind* could have pitched on. For 1*mo*. Unless he could prove (perhaps Dr. *Lesly* may help him to it) that Monarchy is the *only* Government by *divine Right* for the *State*, and that all the Nations of the World who are under any other kind of Government, are, on that Account, in a State of Mortal Sin, his Argument must do a great deal more Hurt than Good to the *Episcopal* Cause. For it will plainly follow

[*b*] On Schism Chap. XIX. Sect. 39. 40. p. 454. 455.

that such Nations as have an *Aristocratical* or *Democratical* Form of Government in the *State*, and are perswaded it is *best*, should have the like in the *Church* too. The *British* Subjects are indeed perswaded that Monarchy is the *best* Government for *Britain*, and, I believe, will always be of this Mind, while so Benign a Princess as Her Majesty fills the Throne; but these same Persons are not perswaded that it would be the *best* for the *United Provinces*, the Republicks of *Venice*, *Genoa*, *Lucca*, the *Swiss Cantons*, *Geneva*, &c, and consequently, they must be perswaded too, according to Mr. *Rhind*'s Way of Reasoning, that a Monarchical Government in the *Church* would not be best for them. His Argument then would quite alter its Nature by a Voyage, and from being a good one *for* Episcopacy at Home, would become a good one *against* it beyond Sea. *2do.* Is it not pretty odd to find one who has *read the Bible all over*, as Mr. *Rhind* saith he has done, and has heard our *Saviour* not only declareing that His *Kingdom is not of this World*, but expresly discharging his Disciples to *exercise such Dominion* and *Authority as the Princes of the* Gentiles *do*, Is it not odd, I say, to find such a one urgeing the Cutting the *Church* Government by the Pattern of the *State*? Does he not know that it was the Fancy of Modelling the external Government of the Church according to the Civil Government of the *Roman* Empire that brought in such Officers to the Church, of whom there is just as much Mention in the Scripture, as there is of the Present Emperour of *Morrocco* or *Czar* of *Muscovy* (*o*). I referr it then to the Reader to Judge, if that can be a good Argument for determining the Government of the Church, which was the greatest Cause of her Corruption. *3tio.* As Mr. *Rhind* has laid the *British* Monarchy in the one Scale, so he must allow me to lay some Instances in the other, and let the Reader weigh both. The *Romans*, who were the greatest Masters of *civil Prudence* ever the World knew, when once they had expelled the *Tarquins* and abolished Regal Government, though they used sometimes *Aristocracy*, sometimes *Democracy* or a Form mixt of both, yet were never so idle or ill-advised as to think of setting up Monarchy again till Usurpers and Tyrants oppressed them, and by main

[*o*] See Dr. *Cave* Primit. Christ. Part. I. Chap. VIII. p. 225. 5.

main Force wrung their Liberties out of their Hands. *Lycurgus* and *Solon* were the wiſeſt Men of their Age by the Verdict of all the World, yet they ſet up, the One *Ariſtocracy*, the other *Democracy*, and recommended them for ever to their People. *Plato* and *Ariſtotle* are Names will be ever had in Veneration, yet they had but very indifferent Thoughts of Monarchy becauſe of its Liableneſs to degenerate into Tyranny. And that which makes the *Britiſh* Monarchy ſo deſireable is that the two Houſes of Parliament qualifie it, and give it a Mixture both of *Ariſtocracy* and *Democracy*; Whereas the *Prelacy* contended for by its late Patrons, is a downright Tyranny, a Monarchy after the French Form, none daring to ſay to the Biſhop, *what doeſt thou*? as we ſhall hear afterward. 4to. Is it not ſtrange that the Church of *England* Divines (Dr. *Whitaker*, for Inſtance, *Regius Profeſſor* of Divinity in *Cambridge*) when diſputing againſt the Church of *Rome* ſhould argue *againſt* a Monarchical Government in the Church; and yet that Mr. *Rhind*, who pretends to be of that Communion, ſhould argue *for* it when diſputing againſt the *Presbyterians*? I want mightily to be ſatisfied about his Conduct in this.

His Second Argument from the *Principles* of the *Presbyterians* runs thus p. 34. *I wou'd know of them, why they are for a Subordination of* Judicatories, *while they are at the ſame Time againſt an Imparity of* Rulers? Really the *Presbyterians* own themſelves ſo dull, as not to be able to give a Reaſon for that which is not. Let Mr. *Rhind* once prove *that* they are againſt an *Imparity of Rulers*, and then it will be ſoon enough to give a Reaſon *why* they are ſo: For they are not diſpoſed to philoſophize on the *Golden Tooth*. He never ſuſpected that his *Medium* wanted Truth, and therefore he goes on very innocently in his Harangue thus. 'To what Purpoſe, I wou'd ask them, ſerves 'a Subordination of Judicatories, where the Judges are ſuppoſed 'to be ſtill the ſame? Did Mr. *Rhind* never hear that *plus vident Oculi quam Oculus*, *Two Eyes ſee better than One*? Does he not know that all the Apoſtles were Equal in their Apoſtolical Character, and when the Controverſy about *Circumciſion* was ſtarted at *Antioch Acts*, 15. Doubtleſs *Paul*, being under an infallible Conduct, could have determined it as Orthodoxly as the whole College of 'em; yet, for ſatisfieing Peoples Minds, it was judged expedient that the Advice

of

of the reſt ſhould be had, and their Authority interpoſed. O but ſaith he, *In the Presbyterian Subordination the Judges are ſtill the ſame.* Now, what could put this in his Head, or how he could poſſibly ſtumble into it, I cannot conjecture. Was he ſo long among the *Presbyterians* and does not know it to be falſe? Could he meet with never one in the whole Country to tell him it was ſo? When I'm ſure there are very few in the Nation but could have done it. All Matters that come from a Subordinate to a Superiour Judicatory are tranſmitted either by way of *Reference* or *Appeal.* In the firſt of theſe Caſes the *Judges* are not meerly the *ſame*, but a vaſt Plurality added to them, for Inſtance, when a Matter is *Referred* from a *Presbytry* to a *Synod*, the whole Miniſters of the Province with a Ruling Elder from each Pariſh are Judges in the latter: Whereas in the former, only the Miniſters of that particular Presbytry with one Ruling Elder from each of its Pariſhes were the Judges. In the Caſe of *Appeals*, not one Member of the Inferior Judicatory is admitted to be a Judge in the Superior. They are indeed allowed to *plead*, but the pleading being over, they are not allowed to *adviſe* much leſs to *vote* in the Proceſs. The Uſe then of a Subordination of Judicatories is obvious, to wit, that the Superior may rectifie the Miſtakes &c of the Inferiour. But this will not go down with Mr. *Rhind*: For he cannot *underſtand* how their Fellow Members (*to whom they are ſuppoſed* in all Reſpects equal) *ſhall judge better than they.* I know no Body obliged to find him in *Underſtanding*. The Thing is abundantly Intelligible in its ſelf, *Solomon* a wiſe enough Maſter haveing told us, that *In Multitude of Counſellors there is Safety.* But whence did Mr. *Rhind* learn that all the Members of a *Presbyterian* Judicatorie were to be ſuppoſed *in all Reſpects Equal*? Was it from the *Presbyterians*? Surely not. They willingly own, that all the Miniſters, for Inſtance, in one Presbytry are not Equal in *all* Reſpects. One of them is more *Learned* than another. Another perhaps, tho' he hath not ſo much Learning, is yet *Wiſer*, for the greateſt Clerks are not always the Wiſeſt Men. Was it from his Fellow Writers of the *Epiſcopal* Side? No. On the contrary, They plainly declare, that the *Presbyterians* neither plead nor ſuppoſe any ſuch Thing. Thus the Author of the *Seventh* Book of *Hooker's Eccleſiaſtical Polity* Sect 3d. "They, *ſaith he*, which cannot brook the Superiority which Biſhops have

'have, do notwithstanding themselves admit that some Kind of Dif-
'ference and *Inequality* there may be lawfully amongst Ministers.
'*Inequality* as touching Gifts and Graces they grant, because this is
'so plain that no Mist in the World can be cast before Men's Eyes so
'thick, but they needs must discern through it, that one Mini-
'ster of the Gospel may be more Learned, Holier and Wiser; better
'able to instruct, more apt to rule and guide than another? Let
Mr. *Rhind* then say at his best Leisure, whence he got that *supposed E-*
quality in all *Respects*.

His Third Argument is taken from the Practices of the *Presbyterians* themselves, The Sum of which in his own Words p. 35. is. That,
'though by their Principles all Church Officers are allowed an equal
'Authority, yet in Effect the whole, or at least the Chief Power is in the
'*Hands of a Few*, who are the most knowing and Wise. *And for*
'*proof of this he brings an Instance, how that* in three several General As-
'semblies, though the most numerous Party in the *Assembly* were
'earnest to have the *intrinsick Power* of the Church asserted by an *Act*,
'yet the *Authority* of a leading *Junto*, who were *upon the matter* so
'many Bishops, crushed that Dangerous Affair. Why then, *saith he*
'p. 37. do they oppose that kind of Government, which is not only
'indispensibly necessary in it self, but does in despite of their Principles
'actually obtain among themselves. Thus he. In Answer to which.
How lucky so ever Mr. *Rhind* may be in some of his *Minuts*, yet perhaps he is the most *unlucky* in his Arguments ever Man was: They being generally so ill natured as to cut their own Throat. For 1*mo*. who told him that it is against *Presbyterian* Principles, that one Minister should have a greater Hand in manageing affairs than another? Not the *Presbyterians*, they refuse it. Not his Brethren the Authors on the *Episcopal* Side; Witness him last cited who tells us (*Ibid.*) 'A
'Priority of Order they deny not but that there may be, yea such a
'Priority as maketh one Man amongst many a Principal Actor in
'those Things whereunto sundry of them must necessarily concurr,
'so that the same be admitted only during the Time of such Acti-
'ons and no longer. 2*do*. is it indeed true, that the *Presbyterian* Government is *in effect* in the Hands of a *Few*, who are *upon the Matter* Bishops? Then it is certainly true, that they are not *Schismaticks*, consequently that Mr. *Rhind's* separating from them on that Score is un-

justifiable

juſtifieable. Is this my reaſoning only? No, but of one of the beſt Men perhaps ever wore Mitre, I mean Dr. *Bedell* afterwards Biſhop of *Kilmore* in his Anſwer to Mr. *Waddeſworth* once a Miniſter in *Suffolk*, then a *Roman Catholick* and Penſioner of the *Holy Inquiſition* in *Sevil*. *Waddeſworth* in his Scripts after his Revolt fell foul upon the *Reformation* in theſe Words. 'In *France*, *Holland* and *Germany* they have no Biſhops.' To this Dr. *Bedell* anſwers (*p*). 'What if I ſhould defend they have? 'becauſe a Biſhop and a Presbyter are all one, as S. *Jerom* maintains, 'and proves out of Holy Scripture, and the Uſe of Antiquity. Of which 'Judgment, as *Medina* confeſſeth, are ſundry of the Ancient Fa- 'thers, both *Greek* and *Latine*, *S. Ambroſe*, *Auguſtine*, *Sedulius*, *Primaſius*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Theodoret*, *Oecumenius* and *Theophylact*: Which point 'I have largely treated of in another Place. Thus he. But Mr. *Waddeſworth* was an Adverſary much of Mr. *Rhind*'s Temper, not to be ſatisfied without *Biſhops* ſuperiour to *Presbyters*. Dr. *Bedell* therefore finds a Way to make all the Proteſtant Churches *Epiſcopal*. In *Germany* the Superintendents were Biſhops. But what was to be done with *France* and *Geneva* where theſe were not? Why, *ſaith he*, there 'are uſually certain *Chief Men*, that do *in a Manner* bear *all* the Sway.--- 'And what are theſe but *Biſhops indeed* unleſs we ſhall wrangle about 'Names. I hope Mr. *Rhind* is here fitted with a Wedge of his own Timber. Common Senſe Dictates that Superiority in Wiſdom and Dexterity for managing Buſineſs attended with a due Integrity ſhould bear Sway among all Societies, even where the Conſtituent Members are otherwiſe equal in their Character: Which amounts to no more than this, that the Weaker ſhould follow the Counſel of the Wiſer, and no other Superiority but this could the *Doctor* find neceſſary by the Word of God among Miniſters. But, ſaith Mr. *Rhind*, 'Why do thoſe whoſe Superior Abilities entitle them to the Chief 'Power, and who exerciſe the ſame in Fact, refuſe to be regularly admitted to the Exerciſe thereof, that is plainly, to be *conſecrated* Biſhops? I anſwer from the excellent Lord *Falkland* who died in the Bed of Honour fighting for the Royal Martyr (*q*). 'There was 'once a Hen in *Æſop*, which upon a moderate Proportion of Barly laid

[p] Burnet's Life of Biſhop Bedell p. 453. 454. [q] See his Speech before the Houſe of Commons concerning Epiſcopacy in Rushworth's Collect. Vol. I Part III. p. 182.

'laid every Day an Egg. Her Mistress enlarging her Diet in Hopes 'she would proportionally encrease her Eggs, She grew so fat upon 'that Addition that She never laid more. Dignities and Preferments oftimes turn Men's Heads, blunt their Wits, or rebate the Edge of their Diligence. How often has it been seen that a very good *Minister* has made but a very indifferent *Bishop*? So long as they are equal in Authority, they know it is only their Superior Wisdom and Vertue that can entitle them to Respect from or Sway among their Brethren. This *first* excites their Spirits, and *then* keeps them on the Bend: But when once they are settled in the Dignity by a formal Instalment, they know that Reverence is due to their Character, how unaccountable soever their Conduct is. Of all sorts of *Bishops*, these are the most desireable whose Dignity rises and falls in Proportion with their real Merit and wise Managment. This puts them upon their good Behaviour, which is necessary for Clergy-men as well as for other People. And this is plainly the Case of our *Presbyterian* Bishops. To all this Mr. *Rhind* may please to add, that they refuse, and their Brethren will not allow them to be *consecrated* to the Dignity, because it is not only without Warrant, but against the Precept of our Lord *Matth.* 20.25, whereof afterwards. In the mean Time Mr. *Rhind* having acknowledged that the *Presbyterians* have such as are Bishops *upon the Matter*; 'tis plain He has separated from them for the Want of what is not *Material*. 3*to*. As to his Instance of the *Act* Assertory of the *Intrinsick Power*. If he had said, that the *Junto*, as he calls them, by *Importunity* prevailed on, or by pure Dint of *Reason* perswaded the Rest that such an *Act* was either not necessary or not seasonable at that Time; I believe he had spoke Truth, but nothing to the Purpose, because *Presbyterians* still own, that some, who in Point of *Authority* are only on a Levell with their Brethren, may yet be superior to them in the *Ecclesiastical* Politicks. But to say that they got it crushed by their *Authority* was to be too prodigal of his Credit, the whole Nation knowing it to be false. 4*to*. I know that Mr. *Rhind* mentioned this Instance by Way of Reflection against the *Presbyterians*, and therefore I must take the Freedom to tell him, that the *General Assembly* has done more, even since the *Revolution*, for asserting the *Intrinsick Power* than all the Prelatists in *Scotland* ever had the Courage to do. These latter, upon the Restauration of K. *Charles*

II, meanly truckled to an avowed *Erastian* Usurpation without the least Remonstrance or Reclaiming. And when the late K. *James* sent down his Proclamation of the Date *Feb.* 12. 1687. for an unbounded *Toleration*, wherein, by his Absolute Power and Prerogative Royal, he annulled and revoked the *Penal* Laws against *Papists*; the Archbishop of *Saint Andrews* and the Elect Archbishop of *Glasgow* were the second and third Persons who subscribed a Letter of Thanks to him for the said *Toleration* and *Proclamation*. The Letter bears Date *Feb.* 24. 1687. It is stuffed with the most fulsome Flattery, and a Soothing of the King in those Measures which took away the Barrier of the *Protestant* Religion and at last ruin'd himself. So unwilling were that Unfortunate Prince's best Friends to venture their Posts by giveing him free and honest Counsel; when they might have *possibly* saved their King, and *certainly* their own Consciences by the doing it. The *General Assembly* on the other hand have acted a somewhat better Part: For when in the Year 1692 the Earl of *Lothian* would needs dissolve it in a very abrupt Manner, to say no Worse; the Moderator, with all due Respect to the Civil Powers, and yet with that Courage that became a Churchman possessed of the Chair in the highest Judicatorie, boldly asserted the *Intrinsick Power* even in the Face of a frowning Government, and the whole *Assembly* adhered to him in so doing. I hope then Mr. *Rhind* will see that he should have been wise in his Wrath, and not needlesly have given Occasion to such a Piece of History. 5*to*. His Reasoning concludes alike against *Bishops* as well as the Members of the *General Assembly*; for the World does not want to know that Bishops are not always the Wisest any more than the *best* Men. And he himself was aware of this 'But, *saith he* 'p. 38, When such is the Government of the Church, that there are 'different Spheres in which Men are to act, 'tis *presum'd* they are cho-'sen with Qualifications proportioned to each.' But why should that be *presumed* which no Man can prove, and every Man will deny? and does not he himself own, *That it has too frequently happened, that Men of* inferior *Abilities have attained to the* highest *Ecclesiastical Dignities*. And does not the History of the late Times confirm this? Witness M. *Wallace*, who, in the Year 1662 was preferred to be Bishop of the *Isles*, though he understood not one Syllable of the Native Language of his Dioceses; yet a powerfull Recommendation and the good

good Quality of Pliancy procured him the *Crosier.* But, saith Mr. *Rhind*, *This is not the Fault of the Constitution but of those who prefer them.* Very mannerly! And so all the Faults of the *Bishops* must be charged upon the *Prince.* But the very Constitution has been always such in *Scotland*, that it was at least a very great Hazard if ever a worthy Person was chosen. Generally Men of Merit are modest and love Obscurity; the most unworthy Persons are most forward to put in for Preferments; Courtiers, by whose Eyes and Ears the Prince must see and hear, are most ready to recommend such as are likely to be the most serviceable Tools to themselves in their Political Designs. The Prince's *Conge d' elire* makes the Election of the *Chapter* a Sham. So that upon the whole there was a Fault in the very Constitution, even though the Office had been in it self lawfull.

III. Mr *Rhind* is resolved to end this Argument with one bold Stroke. 'According, *saith he* p. 38. to the Presbyterian Platform, 'the less knowing and Wise are allowed an equal Authority with 'those who deserve it best: An Establishment which seems to bid 'Defiance to Common Sense. Did Mr. *Rhind* never hear of the *Roman* Senate? 'Twas reckoned the most venerable Bench in the World; yet there did *Parity* reign in Perfection, and that notwithstanding the Inequality among the constituent Members in Point of Prudence. That fine Gentleman the younger *Pliny* giveing his Friend *Arrianus* an Account of an Action before the Senate in which he had been employed to plead, tells him *. *Thus it seemed good to the Plurality: For the Votes are numbered not weighed.* NOR CAN IT OTHERWISE BE IN PUBLICK COUNCIL, *in which there is nothing so unequal as the Equality it self: For the Right of all is equal tho' their Prudence is unequal.* Did Mr. *Rhind* never hear of the House of *Lords* or *Commons* in Parliament? Are not all the Members in these several Houses allowed an *Equal* Authority? yet who ever said that they were *equally* qualified, or that it was necessary They should be so? If he has never travelled so far as *Westminster* in his Views, yet did he never hear of the *Lords* of *Session* or *Sena-*

* Sed hoc pluribus visum est. Numerantur enim Sententiæ; non ponderantur. Nec aliud in publico Concilio potest fieri, in quo nihil est tam inæquale quam Æqualitas ipsa: nam cum sit impar Prudentia, par omnium jus est. *Plin.* Lib. ii. Ep. xii.

tors of the *College of Justice* in *Scotland?* Does he not know that none of 'em have a Negative on the Rest; that they have all an *equal* Authority, though they never had, nor probably ever will have *equal* Abilities? Yet one would be very void of *Common Sense* that would venture to say, that their Constitution *bids a Defiance* to it.

So much for his Argument from the *Nature of the Thing*, of which he is so vain, that he affirms p. 39. *it may in some Measure serve to* determine *the Controversy about Church Government:* And I hope, after what has been said, every Reader will grant that he may for ever enjoy that good Opinion of it without fear of a Rival.

ARTICLE II.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Argument for the* Necessity *of instituting* Prelacy *from the Form of Government in the* Jewish *Church, is Examined. From* P. 39. *to* P. 45.

BEFORE I state this Argument, I must put (yet once more) the Reader in Mind, that though the *Presbyterians* are *against* a Subordination of *Pastors*, yet they are *for* a Subordination of *Officers*, as well as the *Prelatists* are. And that therefore when his Argument concludes against *a Parity of Officers*, or for a *Subordinate Form of Government*, it is only a Parcel of Empty insignificant Words huddled together, unless by the former we understand *Presbytry*, and by the latter *Prelacy*. This premised, His Argument stands thus.

'A Government constitute by a Subordination of Rulers was

'actually

'actually approven of by God under the Old Teſtament: For 'the Form of Government which by Divine Inſtitution obtained 'in the *Jewiſh* Church was conſtituted by *Officers* acting in an Im-'parity; *ſuch as* the High Prieſt, Prieſts and Levites; each of which 'were Orders diſtinct from, and Subordinate to the other. p. 40. This is his whole *Medium*, and the only Inference that can juſtly be made from it is (which every *Presbyterian* grants) That ſuch an Imparity was not only Lawfull but alſo beſt for *that* State of the Church. But Mr. *Rhind*'s Inferences from it are of a higher Nature, *viz. That if it was beſt under that Diſpenſation*, he cannot conceive *how it can be reckoned* unlawfull *in the Chriſtian Church*. I cannot but pity the Weakneſs of His *Conception:* For if our Lord has changed the *Jewiſh* Prieſthood, and diſſolved their Polity, and ſet up the Chriſtian very different from it, will not this make it *unlawfull*? O but, by Mr. *Rhind*'s Account, our Lord did not this, he could not do it, it was not conſiſtent with his Wiſdom to do it, plainly, 'it is, *ſaith he*, p. 41, an Impeachment of the Divine Wiſdom to 'think that God would alter that Form of Government which he 'had inſtituted to eſtabliſh another quite different from it. And now you have his whole Argument, an Argument which he *thinks* ſufficient *to prove the* Perpetuity *of that Form*.

In diſcourſing it I ſhall ſhew, *Firſt*. That, as he has laid it, it is horridly Impious. *Secondly*. That his Managment of it againſt the *Presbyterians* is Ridiculous. *Thirdly*. That it is *in it ſelf* Weak, and concludes nothing to the Purpoſe in this Controverſie. *Fourthly*. That if it conclude at all, it concludes for an Univerſal Papacy rather than a *Dioceſan* Prelacy. And *Laſtly*. That it is rejected as inſufficient by the *Epiſcopal* Authors themſelves.

I. The Argument as he has laid it is horridly Impious. God muſt not be Wiſe, that is, he muſt not be God, unleſs Mr. *Rhind* pleaſe. No Chriſtian ought to paſs that Way of talking he has got into without Reſentment. Saucineſs againſt the Almighty is Intolerable. What! Was it not conſiſtent with the Wiſdom of God to alter a Form of Government he had formerly inſtituted? Has Mr. *Rhind* read the *Bible*, and knows not that God governed *Iſrael* firſt by Judges and then by Kings, and yet was infinitly wiſe in both? If he did this in the *State*, why ſhould it reflect on his

Wiſ-

Wisdom to do it in the *Church*? Nay has he not actually done it in the Church? For, was not both the Civil and Ecclesiastical Power Originally in the same Person, in *Adam*, the *Patriarchs*, and *Moses*; and yet under the *Law* did He not put the *Ecclesiastical* Regiment into the Hands of the High Priest, Priests and Levites, so that the King was no longer Priest? And might he not have learned this from Dr. *L---y* Himself *(r)*? The *Jews* fondly dreamed that their Polity was to last with the World, and persecuted the first Martyr *Stephen* to the Death, because he had taught, that *Jesus* of *Nazareth* wou'd *change the Customs which* Moses *delivered* Acts 6. 14. But, if Mr. *Rhind*'s Argument is good, *Stephen*'s Doctrine was False, and the *Jews* Murdering of him was only the Effect of a laudable Zeal. Is it not more agreeable to the Divine Wisdom to think, that the Circumstances of the Church being so vastly altered, her Government should be so too. Under the *Jewish* Dispensation the Church was empaled within a narrow Enclosure, but the *Gospel* was to be preached *to every Creature*. And is not here a fair Foundation for altering the Government? And does not the Apostle to the *Hebrews* C. 7. V. 12. lay it down for a Principle, that *the Priesthood being changed, there is made of Necessity a Change also of the Law*. How Impious is it then to insinuate that such a Change is inconsistent with the Divine Wisdom.

II. His Managment of this Argument against the Presbyterians is Ridiculous. Take it in his own Words p. 43. 'Seeing there 'was one of the highest Order in the Jewish Church, it follows 'unanswerably (taking along with you what I have said above 'upon this Head) that there ought to be one at least in the Chri-'stian Church. This, *saith he*, is enough to prove the Point a-'gainst the *Presbyterians*, and I *defy* them if they shall answer di-'rectly to evade it. This *Defiance* of Mr. *Rhind*'s is the very prettiest I ever heard of. Let the Presbyterians 'take along with them 'what he has said above upon this Head, *that is, let them grant that* 'it is an Impeachment of the Divine Wisdom to think that God would 'alter that Form of Government which he had instituted among the 'Jews to Establish another quite different from it among the Christians,

[r] Finishing Stroke, p. 2.

ſtians, and then it will follow unanſwerably, *that as there was one high Prieſt in the* Jewiſh *Church, there ought to be one at leaſt in the* Chriſtian *Church.* That is, as if he had ſaid, *Pray,* you Presbyterians, *let me bind your Hands, and then I'll undertake to knock out your Brains.* I truely cannot Imagine what Claſs of Men Mr. *Rhind* wrote for. *Presbyterians* will be ſo far from *taking along with them* his Aſſertion, that they cannot otherwiſe look on it than as a moſt rude Attaque on the Divine Majeſty. He goes on with his reaſonings. 'I ask them, *ſaith he* p. 44. whether it be juſt to condemn 'the Order as uſeleſs among *Chriſtians,* becauſe one is not able to 'perform all the Offices belonging to it? Or whether it be not 'rather reaſonable to acknowledge, that as there was in the Jewiſh 'Church, one Eccleſiaſtical Ruler of the higheſt Order, and no 'more, becauſe one was ſufficient; ſo ſhould *Chriſtians* have one 'at leaſt and as many moe as are needfull? The *Presbyterians* are heartily content with the Propoſal: For, they believe every Goſpel Miniſter to be an Eccleſiaſtical Ruler of the *higheſt* Order, and are very well perſwaded that one of them is needfull in every Congregation. They are ſo far from being againſt multiplying of *Biſhops,* that where there is one in *England,* they wiſh there were three hundred. But, ſaith Mr. *Rhind,* 'Let them allow one Biſhop for 'every Diſtrict, in Proportion to that, to which the High Prieſt's 'Authority did extend, and the Debate is at an End. The Preſbyterians will be content with this likewiſe upon *two* very reaſonable Conditions. *1ſt.* If he can prove that there is any *Divine* Inſtitution appointing it to be ſo. But Mr. *Rhind*'s dictating to God and thinking it *reaſonable* it *ſhould* be ſo, will not be admitted by them as a Proof of this. *2d.* If he can prove that the Eccleſiaſtical Rulers of the higheſt Order in the Chriſtian Church are appointed for the ſame Functions the High Prieſt was under the Law. The High Prieſt, that I may ſpeak in M. *Dodwell*'s Stile, was to offer up the National or Popular Sacrifices for appropriating to the *Jews* only (whether by Birth or Proſelytiſm, it is the ſame Thing) the Priviledge of the *Segullah,* and the Patronage of the Supream Being. But in all the New Teſtament I cannot find, that any ſuch either National or Provincial Appropriation was ever deſigned to be the End of any of the Functions of any Goſpel Ruler. Nay we find all on

the

the contrary: For, by the Gospel Constitution, all that worship the same Supream Being and in the same Way that he has appointed are within the Church, whatever National Distinctions they have.

III. The Argument is *in it self* weak, and concludes nothing to the Purpose in this Controversy, because from the whole Strain of the Scriptures it is plain, that the *Aaronick* Priesthood was Typical, and had at once both its End and Accomplishment in Christ. Mr. *Rhind* was aware of this Exception, and therefore Essays to take it off by two Answers. 1*st*. *If the Constitution of the* Levitical *Priesthood was Subordinate, the* Christian *must be so too, otherwise the Type is not adequatly represented by the Antitype* p. 42. This the Presbyterians grant: For Christ is the great *High Priest of our Profession* Heb. 3. 1. And all other Christians are a *Royal Priesthood* 1 Pet. 2. 9. Subordinate to him. But otherwise, that the Orders of the Clergy among Christians should be adjusted to these among the *Jews* is a ridiculous Dream; seeing, from the one End of the New Testament to the other, the Title of *Priest* is never given to the Ministers of the Gospel as such. His 2*d* Answer is, 'That though these Parts of the 'Priestly Office which did prefigure the *Sacrifice* and Intercession 'of *Jesus Christ* were to cease upon his Crucifixion and Ascension, 'yet that the High Priest was also a *Governour* in the *Jewish* Church, 'and that the *Ordinary* Priest *had a share* in the Government with 'Him, though Subordinate to Him, and that the *Levites* were Sub-'servient to both. *And he is* Confident that the Presbyterians will 'not *affirm* that the High Priest or Inferior Priests did Typify any 'Thing under the Reduplication of *Rulers*, or the *Levites* as 'under them, or that there was any Thing Typical in their Sub-'ordination as such. But this Answer is in *all* its Parts unserviceable, and in *some* of them quite Opposite to himself. For 1. We have already † heard Mr. *Dodwell* declareing, That, *it is the Bishops Presidency not in the Christian* Assemblies *only, but in their* Sacrifices *which can entitle to a Principle of Unity*. Therefore Mr. *Rhind* destroys the Argument by abstracting from the *Sacrifices* and insisting on the *Government*, and by considering the *Jewish* Church Officers not as *Priests* but as *Rulers*. 2. If the Subordination as such among the *Jewish*

† See before Chap. II. Sect. II.

Jewish Church Rulers was not Typical, then where is there any Necessity, by that Argument, for any such Subordination in the Christian Church? 3. Why is he so *Confident* that the *Presbyterians* will not *affirm*, that the High Priest or Inferior Priests did typify any Thing under the Reduplication of *Rulers*? He owns he had read the *Presbyterian* Authors with a *Scrupulous Exactness* particularly the *Altare Damascenum*. Now the Author of that Work expressly affirms it (*s*). 'The 'very *Eminency*, saith he, of the High Priest, in which the Episcopal 'Writers place the Order and *Eutaxy* of that Government, was *Typical*, and shadowed the *Supereminent Dignity* of our High Priest 'above all other Priests, whose Priesthood has an Influence on all 'the Faithfull, and makes them Priests and Pastors in an Ethical 'though not Political Sense. 'Tis then plain that Mr. *Rhind*'s *Confidence* in this Point has been much greater than his *Caution*. 4. Seing under the *Jewish* Dispensation the *Ordinary* Priests *had a Share* in the Government with the High Priest, Why did not Mr. *Rhind* tell us *what Share* the *Ordinary* Priests in the Church of *England* have with their *Diocesans* or High Priests in the Government? I cannot find it, No wonder truly, for the great *Bacon* Lord *Verulam* could not. This is one of the Things wherein, he confesses, he could never be satisfied, viz. the *Sole* Exercise of their Authority. 'The Bishop, *saith* 'he (*t*), giveth Orders *alone*, excommunicateth *alone*, judgeth *alone*. 'This seems to be a Thing almost *without Example* in Government, and 'therefore not unlikely to have creept in, in the *Degenerate* and *Corrupt* 'Times. Thus he. Where is then the Subordination in Government which Mr. *Rhind* pleads for?

IV. His Argument, if it conclude at all, concludes for an Universal *Papacy* rather than a Diocesan *Prelacy*: For there was but one High Priest over the *Jews*, and consequently there should be but one Supream Bishop over the *Christian* Church. And indeed Mr. *Dodwell* has roundly asserted, that the Original Government of the Christian Church was a *Papacy*. That the whole Christian Churches

(s) Alt. Damasc. p. 140. Sed cum sancti omnes sint Deo sacerdotes, annon illa ipsa EMINENTIA summi sacerdotis in qua illi ponunt Ordinem & Eutaxiam, TYPICA fuit, & SUPEREMINENTIA summi pontificis nostri supra alios omnes sacerdotes DIGNITATEM adumbrabat, cujus sacerdotium in omnes fideles influit, & Ethicos, licet non politicos in externo regimine sacerdotes & Pastores facit? (t) Certain Considerations touching the Church of *England*. p. 14.

were subject to the Church at *Jerusalem*, and that the Bishop of *Jerusalem* was the Principle of *Catholick* Unity, and that there were no other Bishops in the World but himself, and that the setling of Bishops in particular Dioceſſes was an Aftergame. This is M. *Dodwell*'s Doctrine (*v*). And it agrees very well with the Argument from the *Jewish* Priesthood. He indeed took Pains to prevent the Consequence that this Doctrine might seem to have in Favours of the Church of *Rome*, by teaching, as we shall hear afterwards, that the Government was *altered* in the *Second* Century; but Mr. *Rhind* by declareing an *Alteration* Inconsistent with the Wisdom of our Lord, has plainly betrayed the *Protestant* Cause. He foresaw that this Objection would be made against his Argument. Let us hear how he wards it off. *This, Cavil*, saith he, p. 43. *is, I confess very Plausible, and our Adversaries do triumph upon it as unanswerable; but they do not perhaps know whom they oblige by this.* Well, pray who are they? *Let me tell them*, saith he, *That the Roman Catholicks are no less fond of it than they.* But let me tell Mr. *Rhind*, that this is to write not only weakly but ridiculously. When the *Prelatists* go in to the worst Part of *Popery* by insisting on an Argument which, supposing its Solidity, must needs found the *Pope*'s Supremacy, must not the *Presbyterians* (who have proved a hundred Times, that 'tis absurd to inferr the Form of Government in the *Christian* from that of the *Jewish* Church) tell them so much for fear of obliging the *Roman Catholicks*? This is a new Way he has got of turning the Chace, which may be admired, but, I believe, will scarcely be followed by any Wise Man. But after all this, how does he defend his Argument against the *Papists*? He indeed referrs his Reader to the *Authors* who have managed this Controversy against them; but his own Defence is absolutly Naught. 'Tis this p. 43. ' In so confined a Society as was the *Jew*-' *ish* Church, any more than one Officer of the highest Order was need-' less; seeing the People could easily repair to him, from the remotest ' Corners of *Judea*, upon all the proper Occasions; and one was sufficient

(*v*) Parænes. Sect. 6 p. 9 Ecclesiæ Catholicæ universæ primatum tenuit Episcopus Hierosolymitanus. Parem illi quem similiter tenuit pontifex templi Hierosolymitani Judæus in synagogas Judæorum per orbem terrarum ubique dispersas. Et parem illi quem sibi vendicat per Christianum orbem universum Pontifex Romanus.

'cient for the Discharge of all the Duties of that Office. But since the 'Partition Wall is broken down, the Church is become a Society of 'so large an Extent, that all the Faithfull cannot have Access to one, 'nor can one serve all the Purposes of that Office. But why may not *one serve all the Purposes of that Office*, now, as well as during the whole *first* Century and a Part of the *second* according to M. *Dodwell*? 'Tis true the Professors of Christianity are more numerous *now* than they were *then:* Yet not more widely dispersed. For if we may believe Antiquity, Christianity got considerable footing in the Apostles Days even in the Nations most remote from *Jerusalem* the Center. And that S. *Andrew*, S *Simon* the *Canaanite*, and as some say, S. *Paul* himself planted the Gospel in *Britain*. And if the Bishop sitting at *Jerusalem*, could be a Principle of Unity to us *then*, why might not the Bishop of *Rome*, who is much nearer hand, be so to us *now*? Let Mr. *Rhind* satisfie the *Roman Catholicks*, how, for Instance, all the Faithfull in the Cities of *London* and *Westminster* amounting to about a Million of Souls, how all the Faithfull in the rest of *Middlesex*, *Essex* and Part of *Hartford* Shire on this Side the Globe, how all the Faithfull in the forreign *English Plantations* on the other Side the Globe and in both the *Indies* can have Access to the Bishop of *London* their *Diocesan*, or how he can serve all the Purposes of that Office to them. Let Mr. *Rhind*, I say, satisfie the *Roman Catholicks* in this; and then I believe *they* will find it no hard Matter to shew how all the Faithfull through the World may have Access to *one* Pope at *Rome*, and how *one* Pope alone may serve all the Purposes of that Office to the Church Universal. 'Tis plain then that Mr. *Rhind*'s Argument must needs inferr the Necessity of the Pope's Supremacy.

V. His Argument is rejected as Insufficient by the *Episcopal* Authors themselves. It will be enough to establish this from the Mouth of *two* Witnesses. The first is Bishop *Bilson* (x) 'From 'these superior and inferior Degrees, *saith he*, amongst the Priests 'and Levites under *Moses*, haply may *no necessary Consequence* be 'drawn to force the same to be observed in the Church of Christ. 'First, For that the Tribe of *Levi* might not be unguided without manifest Confusion, and was not subjected to the Regiment of any

(x) Perpetual Gov. of Christ's Church Chap. II. p. 122

'other Tribe, but had the same Manner of Government by he
'Prince, Elders, Judges and Officers over Thousands, Hunders
'Fifties and Tens. And afterward this Preeminence grew unt
'them according to their Families by Inheritance and Birthright
'The Father was Chief of his Offspring whiles he lived and after
'him his Eldest, *which is no Way imitable in the Church of Christ.* Thus *Bilson.*

A Second Witness is the famous *Stillingfleet* a much greater Man than *Bilson.* He not only asserts (y) but proves irrefragably that the Christian Church was formed not upon the *Temple* but the *Synagogue* Model, where there was no such Thing as a Hierarchy, but a Ruler of the Synagogue one or moe, with a *Primacy* in Point of *Order*, but an *Equality* of Power with the rest of the Elders of the Synagogue. Mr. *Rhind* then, ere his Argument can hurt the Presbyterians must both answer the *Reasons* and refuse the *Authority* of his Brethren and Fathers.

And thus I have done with this Argument; And cannot but wish, that the *Episcopal* Writers of the *New cut* were somewhat less *Jewishly* given. They are not content to plead for a *Jewish Government* in the Church, but have turned also our *Communion Tables* into *Altars*, our *Ministers* into *Priests*, and the *Communion* into a *Propitiatory Sacrifice*; yea M. *Dodwell* (z) has found the Ancient Bishops wearing the *Sacerdotal Frontlet* in Imitation of the *Jewish* High Priest. Yea he has found † their Succession *Hereditary*. Who knows where the Humor may stop? If they *go on* at the same Rate, 'tis to be feared they may turn Christianity into somewhat more than a *Mystical Israelitism*, and revive upon us the old *Controversy*, that *except we be circumcised, we cannot be saved.*

(y) Irenic. Part II. Chap. vi. (z) One Priesthood Chap. ix. Sect. 4. † Ibid. Sect. 5.

PART

ARTICLE III.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Argument for the* Neceſſity *of inſtituting* Prelacy *from the Rules of political Prudence in Compliance with the* Jews *and* Romans, *is examined. From* P. 45. *to* P. 49.

THIS is an Argument which, as Mr. *Rhind* has diſcourſed it, is, I dare affirm, a pure Orginal Piece; and that as no Man ever uſed it before him, ſo no Man readily will after him. The Summ of it is. The *Jews* were Zealous for their *Hierarchy*, the *Romans* were under a *Monarchy*. A Parity of *Officers* or *levelling* kind of Government (ſuch as he, with equal Juſtice and Accuracy, ſuppoſes the Presbyterian to be) would have *quite alienated* the *Jews* from, and *raiſed the Jealouſie* of the *Romans* againſt Chriſtianity. Therefore *it was not Conſiſtent with the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of our* Lord *and the Inſpiration of his* Apoſtles, *who became all Things to all Men, to provoke their* Averſion *by determining againſt their* Inclinations p. 46. And if they had Inſtitute ſuch a *Republican* Form as the *Presbyterian* is, their doing ſo would have juſtified the Perſecutions were raiſed by their Enemies againſt them. 'For, *ſaith he*, p. 47. would they be juſtly blamed, if, for their 'own Security, they ſhould endeavour to Cruſh a Society of ſo 'dangerous a Conſtitution. *And therefore he* leaves it to the Conſi- 'deration of all Wiſe and Impartial Readers, whether it be not a 'Thought too unworthy to be entertained of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, 'that They ſhould have given Occaſion to *ſo reaſonable* a Jealouſie, 'and

'and exposed Christians to Persecution, upon an Account a-'bout which they might have Innocently agreed with Their 'Enemies.

Here is indeed a masterfull Stroke. Here is Infinite Wisdom limited and Infinite Freedom confined in the most Effronted Manner. All the Business of the Sons of Men is to know what Government Christ and his Apostles actually did establish, and upon finding that, to take it upon Trust that it was the very Best. But to prescribe, what Government Christ and his Apostles were obliged in *Prudence* to Establish, is Presumptuous in the highest Degree. But waveing this, let us try whether his Premisses will inferr his Conclusion.

I. As to the *Jews*. They were *Zealous* for their *Hierarchy*. *Ergo*, saith Mr. *Rhind*, Christ and his Apostles institute one too, because it would have been disobligeing to them to institute *Presbytry*. But is it not much more reasonable to argue the quite contrary Way, *viz.* That because the *Jews* were Zealous for their *Hierarchy*, therefore Christ and his Apostles did not institute one; because if they had, it would have exasperated the *Jews* to the greatest Height, and provoked them to rivile the Christians as *Schismaticks*, yea to curse them as they did the *Samaritans* for setting up Altar against Altar? Yes, this is so very obvious to common Sense, that M. *Dodwell* (*a*) Himself gives it as the Reason, why during the first Times of the Apostles they did for a while forbear the Setting any Bishop up in *any* considerable Superiority over his Brethren. 'For, '*saith he*, if this Superiority of the *Bishop* were a Substitut-'ing him in the Place of the *High Priest*, and the 'Multiplying such Superiors in several Cities were the mul-'tiplying *High Priests* in several Cities; it plainly appears how 'this must have been interpreted by those who were *Jewishly* af-'fected, from the Principles already mentioned. They must have 'looked on such Persons as not only *Violators of their Law*, but as '*breakers of their mystical Union*, and consequently obnoxious to the 'same *Curses* and *Execrations* which on the same Account had been 'thundered against the *Samaritans*. Thus he. Yea, he tells us elsе-

[a] One Priesthood Chap. IX. Sect. 7. p. 248.

elsewhere (*b*), that Christ was so far from instituting a *Hierarchy*, that he did not so much as intimate to his Disciples that ever any *Hierarchy*, distinct from the *Jewish* which already obtained, was to be set up; yea, that if he had intimate any such Thing, the Disciples themselves had been in Peril of Revolting from him on that very Account. I hope then we are in no great Hazard from the *Jews*.

II. As to the *Romans*. 'Tis True they were under *Monarchy*. *Ergo* say I. 1*mo*. Such a Constitution in the Church as made every Bishop a *Monarch* in his own City, and raised him to a *Throne* (I hope Mr. *Rhind* knows the *Episcopal* Stile) would have heightened their Jealousie and provoked their Indignation against the Christians. For, tho' our Lord disclaimed all medling with Secular Affairs, and at length became invisible, upon which Accounts the *Romans* had no *just* Reason to be in any Apprehension from himself; yet who knows not that *States* are Jealous even of the smallest Appearances? Was it not Christ's being called *King of the Jews* that stung *Herod* so sharply that he sought to murder him in his Cradle? Was it not on the same Pretence that *Pilat* condemned him in Judgment, when he had acquitted him in his Conscience? If they were thus Jealous of a Monarch who owned His *Kingdom not to be of this World*, and was shortly to leave it; would they not have been much more so if a visible Monarch, *Independent of the State*, had been set up in every City? And has not the Event shewed that they had had Reason for such Jealousie, when Bishops in most Kingdoms have made such Encrouchments on the Civil Government, and the Bishop of *Rome* has set his Foot on the Necks of the greatest Emperours. And does not Mr. *Dodwell* himself confess, (*c*) That it was the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, upon whom, as he fancies, all the Christian Churches through the World did depend, that provoked the *Gentiles* to Rage so much in Persecution against that Church, that the Head being once lopt off, Christianity might be ruined at once. 2*do*. If a *Prelatical* Form of Government would have any Way recom-

[b] Parænes. Sect. 14. p. 58. [c] Parænes. Sect. 16. p. 68. Suspicor hoc fine adeo in Ecclesiam Hierosolymitanam sævisse Gentiles, ut, a capite sublato, res Christiana universa una concideret.

recommended the *Christian* Church to the Favour of secular Princes, or even alleviate their Spite against Her, Is it not strange that none of the *Apologists* for *Christianity* ever insisted on that Topick? Is it not strange that the younger *Pliny*, *(d)* who gave the Emperour so Discreet an Account of the Christians, never mentioned how well their Government was suited to that of the Empire? 3*to.* Why should Mr. *Rhind* Imagine that a *Parity of Officers* would appear any uncouth Thing to the *Romans*: For, had they not a Couple of *Consuls* of equal Dignity chosen annually? Nay, did it not shortly after this grow in use to have a Couple of *Emperours* (sometimes more) reigning with consent, *Æquo Jure* as *Eutropious* (*e*) expresses it. So far were they from having an ill Opinion of Parity. 4*to.* Does not 1. *Rhind* know that most of all the brave Spirits among the Romans in the Apostles Days secretly groaned under the imperial Chains; impatiently longed for, and sometimes bravely attempted the Recovery of their ancient Liberties and Government? Does he not know that upon the Death of *Caligula* the Senate decreed that the Memory of the *Cæsars* should be extinguished, and the Temples built to their Honour thrown down, and that, by the *Tribune* of the People they Discharged *Claudius*, who had been saluted Emperour by the Army, to enter on the Administration, though indeed they were at last overpowered by a military Force? If therefore we were to reason on such Common Place Arguments, 'tis plain that a *Monarchical* Form of Government in the Church would have most excited the Jealousie of the *Prince*; and that a *Republican* Form would have gained her most Proselyts among the *People*.

But, saith Mr. *Rhind* p. 48, *we do not find that ever their Persecutors did charge it upon them as a Crime, that the Church was of a* Republican *Constitution.* True indeed they did not: For they knew that the Christians owned Christ as their Head and King, and on that Account misrepresented them as Rebells and Seditious Persons, and raised Persecution against Them. *Judæos* (saith *Sueton*) *(f) Impulsore* Chresto *assidue tumultuantes* Roma *expulit.*

But

[*d*] Ep. 97. Lib. x. (*e*) Breviar. Lib. viii. (*f*) In Claud. Cap. xxv.

But I have insisted too long against an Argument the most Maggotish was ever bred in the Head of a Liveing Creature. I doubt not but the Reader is Curious to know what could put him upon it. The Discovery of this is no hard Matter. 1*mo.* It was even pure Love to the *French* King, that he might Justifie Him in all his Barbarous Usage of his *Protestant* Subjects. Who could have blamed the *Roman* Emperours, if, for their own Security they had crushed the *Christian* Church, in Case her Government had been *Presbytry*? This is his *Doctrine*; and is not the *Use* of it very obvious, *viz.* The Government of the *French* Protestant Churches was *Presbytry*; who then can blame His *most Christian Majesty* for Crushing a Society of so dangerous a Constitution? 2*do.* It was to teach our own Princes at Home how they are in all Time coming to treat us. We are *Presbyterians*, and *Presbytry* alone is a *reasonable* Ground of *Jealousie* and just Cause of *Persecution*. Thus Mercifull and Gospel-like is the *Prelatick* Spirit. But I go on.

SECT. V.

Wherein Mr Rhind's *Proofs for evincing that* Prelacy *actually was instituted, are examined. From* P. 50. *to* P. 119.

MR. *Rhind* p. 40. falls a Haranguing with a very disdainfull Air, which yet becomes a High-Flyer admirably well. 'A 'Government, *saith he*, constitute by a Subordination of Rulers is 'actually approven of by God, and this he has so fully notified in his 'Word, that to prove it, I am not put to the wretched Shift of ob-'truding upon my Readers any remote Consequences fetched from

'two or three controverted Texts, as the Adversaries in this Case 'are obliged to do. 'Tis very true that a Hierarchy under the *Jewish* Dispensation was both instituted and approven of by God: And how very serviceable to the Cause of Prelacy this is, I believe the Reader is by this Time sufficiently convinced. But now he resolves to rally his Forces and attempts to prove the *Actual Institution* of Prelacy by *six* Arguments, the first four whereof are pretended to be fetched from the Scripture. And no doubt his Reader is in great Expectation: For, after the Harangue you have heard, would not a modest Person be tempted to think, that Prelacy were so legible in the Bible, that one needed only open his Eyes to find it there? And yet 'tis *Mathematically* certain it is not there. How *Mathematically*, you'll say? Why the Incomparable Mr. *Dodwell*, who has stated the Controversie fairly, whose Authorities are Pertinent and justly alledged, and whose Deductions from them, and *all* his other Reasonings do proceed in a *Mathematical* Chain, has frankly owned (*g*) it is not there. Plainly, that Prodigy of Learning has acknowledged, That 'it is not needful that the Form of Government 'to be now observed, should have been delivered in the Canonical 'Scriptures; *That* there is no Place of them which openly professes 'that; *That* there is none of the Sacred Writers treat of Church Government on Design. *Nay that* the Holy Ghost has never described 'any one Form of Government that was to take Place every where 'and at all Times. Mr. *Rhind's* Attempt then was too hardy, and he was too desperate to undertake that which the ablest Champion *Prelacy* ever had owns to be impossible to be done. And now I come in so many *Articles* to examine his *Proofs*, and 'tis a Lucky Presage that they will not be very dangerous, seeing We are sure neither to be oppressed

(g) Paræn. Sect. 14. n. 57. Opus non est ut regiminis Ecclesiastici forma hodie observanda tradita fuerit in scripturis canonicis. . . . Nullus enim est qui id præfiteatur aperte sacri scriptoris locus. Et ne quidem ullus qui ita de regimine agat Ecclesiastico quasi id voluit et scriptor, aut Scriptoris Auctor Spiritus sanctus, unaforman unam aliquam Regiminis ubique & in omne Ævum duraturi describeret. Nusquam scriptores sacri satis expresse tradiderunt, quanta secuta sit in Regimine Ecclesiarum mutatio cumprimum discederent a Synagogarum Communione Ecclesiæ. Nusquam satis aperte quantum donis concessum fuerit Spiritus Sancti personalibus, quantum vicissim locis & officiis. Nusquam Officiarios extraordinarios qui illo ipso seculo finem habituri erant, ab ordinariis satis accurate secernunt. . . .

prefſed with M. *Dodwell*'s Authority, nor ſtraitned with his Reaſonings, but on the contrary will find him frequently helping us to anſwer M. *Rhind*.

ARTICLE I.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Proof for the Inſtitution of* Prelacy *from its obtaining in the Days of* Chriſt, *is Examined. From* P. 50. *to* P. 61.

MR *Rhind* in Diſcourſing this Proof proceeds in the following Method. I. He attempts to reaſon his Reader into a Belief that Chriſt as Monarch of the Church *behoved* to inſtitute *Officers* of *different Orders* under Himſelf, by which we muſt either ſuppoſe him to mean *Prelacy*, or elſe his Argument concludes nothing againſt the Presbyterians. II. He adduces the Inſtance of the *Twelve* Apoſtles ſubordinate to Chriſt, and the *Seventy* Diſciples inferior to them in the Government of the Church. III. He labours with great Induſtry to prove that the Text *Matth.* 20. 25. *The Princes of the Gentiles exerciſe Dominion* &c with its Parallels carries in it *no Inſinuation in Favour of Presbyterian Government*; and that *much leſs can its Inſtitution be inferred from it*. All this I ſhall examine in Order.

I. He attempts to reaſon us into a Belief that Chriſt as Monarch of the Church *behoved* to inſtitute Prelacy. This he does by asking two Queſtions. Firſt, asks he, *After what manner was the Church Governed in the Days of Chriſt?* I anſwer, after no Manner at all. I doubt not but this Anſwer will ſurprize him, but I am

ſure to convince him 'tis a good one. Hear M. *Sage* (*b*) 'It is obvi-
'ouſly obſervable in the Evangelical Records that the Chriſtian
'Church was not, could not be founded till our Lord was riſen, ſee-
'ing it was to be founded on his Reſurrection. Is not this plain
Senſe and Truth too? and if the Chriſtan Church had no Being
before Chriſt's Reſurrection, then certainly no Government; if no
Government, then certainly not *Prelatical* Government, and conſe-
quently M. *Rhind*'s Argument is loſt to all Intents and Purpoſes.
'Tis clear as Light, that ſuch as liſted themſelves with Chriſt in the
Days of his Fleſh were under no diſtinct Government but that of
the *Jewiſh* Church with which they were ſtill incorporate, and from
which, as we have already proved, no Conſequence can be drawn
for the Nature of the *Chriſtian* Government. 'Tis Plain then that all
further Conſideration both of M. *Rhind*'s *Reaſonings* and *Inſtance*
are utterly Needleſs.

But ſhort Anſwers cut one's Houghs, and are apt to be very pro-
voking. Wherefore, that his Harrangue may not be loſt, I ſhall
anſwer his Queſtion according to his Heart's Wiſh, *viz.* That
Our Bleſſed Lord himſelf was its ſole King and Head. And if this will
content him for making the Government of the Church Monar-
chical, I dare promiſe him no *Presbyterian* will contradict him.
But then, upon his Conceſſion, he has a ſecond Queſtion to ask.

Was there ever a Government of a Monarchical Conſtitution,
'where the Monarch did not, yea *behoved* not to derive of his
'Authority in an orderly *Gradation* upon ſeveral *Subordinate* Mini-
'ſters? You ſee here good Reader M. *Rhind*'s Modeſty, But
was Chriſt under the ſame Neceſſity with other Monarchs?
O yes, *Shall we ſuppoſe*, ſaith he, *that he who is King in* Zion *ſhall do*
otherwiſe *in His Church, than all* wiſe Princes *have ever done in their*
Kingdoms? So now you have Mr. *Rhind*'s Heart. Chriſt, the
Wiſdom of God, muſt take his Meaſures from the *wiſe Princes* of the
Earth. But what though all this were True; that not only all
the *wiſe Princes* of the Earth, but even our Lord Himſelf not only
had, but *behoved* to derive of their Authority in an *orderly Grada-*
tion upon ſeveral Subordinate *Officers*; and that a Parity of *Rulers*
under

(*b*) Vind. of the Prin. of the Cypr. Age Chap. VI. Sect. 5. 5.

under a Monarch would make a *Monstrous*, and in it self a *Contradictious* Constitution, how would this affect the *Presbyterians*? For tho' they deny, that Christ while on Earth institute a Subordination of *Officers*, and have a very good Reason for it, as we shall just now hear, yet they both plead for and actually exercise a Government by Subordinate *Officers*. And I hope 'tis very easie to conceive how a Thing may be not only of *Scripture* in the General, but even of *New Testament* Institution, which yet was not Institute by Christ while he was upon Earth. 'Tis then evident that Mr. *Rhind*'s Reasoning, suppose it had no other Faults, yet imports nothing against the *Presbyterians*.

But, if Mr. *Rhind* please, let us abstract from what Christ *behoved* to do, and consider what he did. I affirm that while he was upon Earth he was so far from Instituteing Subordinate *Pastors*, that he did not so much as institute Subordinate *Officers*. And this brings me to Mr. *Rhind*'s Instance.

II. He adduces the Instance of the *Twelve* Apostles Subordinate to Christ, and the *Seventy* Disciples Inferior to them in the Government of the Church. 'Tis needless to spend Words on it. Let us see if the *Episcopal* Authors have not fitted him with an Answer.

The first is Dr. *Whitby* a late fresh Writer. 'Whereas, *saith* 'he, (*i*) some compare the Bishops to the Apostles, the Seventy to 'the Presbyters of the Church; and thence conclude that divers 'Orders in the Ministry were instituted by Christ Himself. It 'must be granted that the Ancients did believe these two to be 'divers Orders, and that those of the Seventy were Inferior 'to the Order of the Apostles; and sometimes they make the Com-'parison here mentioned: But then it must be also granted, that '*this Comparison will not strictly hold*; for the Seventy received not 'their Mission as Presbyters do from Bishops, but immediatly from 'the Lord Christ, as well as the Apostles; and in their first Mis-'sion were plainly sent on the same Errand *and with the same Power*.' Thus Dr. *Whitby*.

The Second is M. *Sage*. 'Our Martyr *Cyprian*, *saith he*, (*k*) (as 'appears

[i] Annot. on *Luke* 10. 1. [k] Ibid. ubi supra.

"appears from his Reaſonings on divers Occaſions) ſeems very well to have known, and very diſtinctly to have obſerved, that *the* Apoſtles *themſelves got not their Commiſſion to be Governours of the Chriſtian Church till after the Reſurrection.* And no wonder, for this their Commiſſion is moſt obſervably recorded *John* 20. 21. 22. 23. No ſuch Thing *any where* recorded concerning the Seventy. Nothing more certain, than that that Commiſſion which is recorded *Luke* 10. did conſtitute them only temporary Miſſionaries and that for an Errand which could not poſſibly be more than temporary. That Commiſſion contains in its own Boſom clear Evidences, that it did not inſtal them in any ſtanding Office at all, much leſs in any ſtanding Office in the Chriſtian Church, *which was not yet in Being when they got it.* Could that Commiſſion which is recorded *Luke* 10. any more conſtitute the LXX ſtanding Officers of the Chriſtian Church, than the like Commiſſion recorded *Matth.* 10. could conſtitute the Twelve ſuch ſtanding Officers? But it is Manifeſt, that the Commiſſion recorded *Matth.* 10. did not conſtitute the Twelve Governours of the Chriſtian Church; otherwiſe what need of a new Commiſſion to that Purpoſe after the Reſurrection? Preſumable therefore it is that S. *Cyprian* did not at all believe that the Seventy had *any* Succeſſors, Office Bearers in the Chriſtian Church, ſeeing it is ſo obſervable that *they themſelves received no Commiſſion to be ſuch Office Bearers.* Thus M. *Sage.* And what now is become of the *Orderly Gradation.* The Apoſtles themſelves were not conſtitute Governing Officers before Chriſt's Reſurrection, How then could the Seventy be inferior to them in the Government of the Church?

And thus now we have heard Mr. *Rhind*'s whole Proof of the obtaining of *Prelacy* in the Days of Chriſt: For not one Inſtance or Declaration more has he for this Purpoſe. Yea indeed he is ſo Ingenuous p. 53. as to diſclaim a *poſitive* Inſtitution; and only pleads p. 61. that the Subordination, which obtained among the *Twelve* Apoſtles and *Seventy* Diſciples, declares what Form of Government Chriſt liked beſt, and conſequently is a *Precedent Equivalent* to an Inſtitution. And We have heard that there was no ſuch *Subordination*, and that therefore it can be no *Precedent.*

But

But Mr. *Rhind* is resolved to be equal with the *Presbyterians*, and to make it good that there is no *positive* Institution of *Parity* in the Four Gospels.

III. He labours with great Industry to prove that the Text *Matth.* 20. 25. 'The Princes of the Gentiles exercise Dominion &c *with its* 'Parallels, *carries in it* no Insinuation in Favour of *Presbyterian* Go-'vernment; and that much less can its Institution be inferred from it. For my own Part, I cannot find any one *Presbyterian* Author that ever insisted on the said Text for a *Positive* Institution of Presbytry, but they urge it as an express Interdiction of *Prelacy*; and from thence in Conjunction with other Scripture Warrants inferr, that, by *Scripture* Institution, the Government of the Church should be *Presbyterian*. But by no means will Mr. *Rhind* allow that the said Text has the least-Aspect that Way; and he affirms p. 55. That the Intent of it is *to correct the Disciples Mistake concerning the Temporal Kingdom of the* Messias, *and to warn them against Pride and Tyranny*, but not at all *to forbid a Subordination of Officers, Pastors*, he should have said. Now that I may do Mr. *Rhind* Justice, I shall consider every Thing he has advanced for wresting this Text out of the *Presbyterian*'s Hands.

1. *It seems*, saith he p. 53, *to favour an Equality, but be it known to you* others *have made use of it* with much more reason *to prove a Preeminence.* The Reader, no doubt, will be in Pain to know who these *others* may be. Plainly 'tis *Bellarmin*, who from thence attempts to prove the *Pope*'s Supremacy; with as much *Reason* no Doubt, as he does the Lawfulness of denying the Cup to the Laity from these Words *Drink ye all of it.*

2. *There are no other Texts*, saith he *ibid. in the four Gospels which the* Presbyterians *do, that I can remember, so much as alledge to this Purpose.* But here his Memory has failed him: For if he had consulted *Didoclavius* or *Stillingfleet* † he might have found another Text, viz. *Matth.* 18. 15. *Tell the Church*, which the *Presbyterians* insist on to the same Purpose with the former.

3. 'The learnedest Authors of that Perswasion, *saith he* p. 54. can-'didly own, that the Equality which they contend for cannot be 'in-

† Alt. Damas. Cap. IV. p. 142.—Irenic. Part. II. Chap. V.

'ferred from this Place. Well, who are these *learnedest Authors*? He instances M. *Pool*. But why does he mention him? He answers, 'because he is of so great Authority with them at this Time. Well, shall the *Presbyterians* consult him? By all means, and saith he, 'they 'will be convinced that I have done him no Injustice. But what Book of his shall they consult? *The* Annotations, saith he, *which pass under his Name.* Now, good Reader, M. *Pool* was Dead and Rotten ere these *Annotations* were written. Plainly it was Dr. *Collins* wrote them, who was indeed a *Dissenter*, though I have not yet heard whether he was a *Presbyterian*. But whatever he was, he was very much inferior in Abilities to M. *Pool*. Are not *Presbyterians* now mightily straitned with M. *Pool*'s Authority.

4. They are *the lesser Presbyterian Authors*, saith he ibid. *by whom it is still insisted on.* I am truly sorry that Mr. *Rhind* should so frequently shew himself unacquainted with the Writers on both Sides, after he had told he had read them with a *Scrupulous Exactness*; or which is much worse, that he should so often bid Defiance to the Sincerity which the Nature of his Composure required. *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Chamier*, *Cartwright*, *Didoclavius*, *Turretine*, the *Belgick*, the *English*, *Diodati*'s Annotations do all of them, besides Scores of others, assert that not only the *tyrrannical* Exercise, but a *Dominion* or Prelacy it self is thereby forbidden to the Pastors of the Church. Were these the *lesser Authors*? But why do I mention them? The *English* Divines themselves from that very Text prove the Pope's Supremacy to be unlawfull by what humble Methods soever attain'd to, or with what Moderation soever exerced. And how the Pope's Supremacy should be unlawfull by Vertue of that Text, and yet the Supremacy of the Primate of all *England*, who is *alterius Orbis Papa*, not be so; it will be hard to give a Reason, except that which the Lord *Falkland* in his forementioned *Speech* has suggested *viz. That they oppose the Papacy beyond* Sea, *that they may settle one beyond the* Water. Hear Dr. *Whitaker*. *It is not*, saith he, (*l*) Humility *in the* Domination *that is required, but the very* Domination *it self that is forbidden.* And then goes on answering the Criticisms advanced by Mr. *Rhind*, but whereof *Bellarmin* was the true Father. The Church of

[*l*] De Pontif. Quest. I. Cap. 3. Sect. 1.

of *England* Divines, to give them their Due, have oftimes made a Noble Stand againſt the Church of *Rome*. No wonder, They had both Truth on their Side, and conſiderable Dignities to loſe in caſe they got the Worſe. But of all Men in the World they are the moſt to be pityed when they have to Diſpute againſt the *Presbyterians*, for the very ſame Arguments wherewith they defeated the *Romaniſts*, with the very ſame *Presbyterians* defeat them; whereby they make the exact Moral of the *Gooſe* in the Fable which was wounded with an Arrow feathered from her own Wing. 5. *The Original Word*, ſaith he p. 56. *which our Tranſlators have rendered* To exerciſe Authority (*Dominion* he ſhould have ſaid) *does properly ſignifie ſuch an exerciſe of it as is Tyrannical*; which he endeavours to prove *Firſt* from *Beza*, *Secondly* from the *Septuagint*, *Thirdly* from S. *Luke Acts* 19. 16. *which*, ſaith he, *is the only other Place where it occurrs in all the New Teſtament*, and certainly implies *Violence* and *Tyranny*, being uſed to ſignifie how the Domoniack *overcame* the Sons of *Sceva*. Now let us examine this. In the *Firſt* Place, *Beza*, on that Place, is not Criticizing on the Word, or telling what it naturally imports, but is Deſcribing the actual Practice of the Princes of the *Gentiles*. And expreſly ſaies (*m*) 'That our Lord there dehorts 'that none amongſt the Miniſters of his Word ſeek Preeminence 'and Power. *Secondly*, As for the *Septuagint*, he has produced no Place where they take the Word in ſuch an *ill* Senſe. 'Tis none of my Buſineſs therefore to conſider where they do ſo; but this is certain that they frequently uſe it in a *good* Senſe. For Inſtance *Gen.* 1. 28. *Have Dominion over the Fiſhes of the Sea.* Pſal. 72. 8. *He ſhall have Dominion from Sea to Sea.* Pſal. 110. 2. *Rule thou in in the Midſt of thine Enemies.* In all thoſe Places the *Greek* Word uſed by Them is the ſame with that in the Text. But will any Body ſay that *Adam*'s, *Solomon*'s or *Chriſt*'s Dominion was to be Tyrannical. *Thirdly*, Is that Place *Acts* 10. 16. which relates the Demoniack's *overcoming* the Sons of *Sceva* the only other Place in all the New Teſtament where the Original Word is uſed? I wiſh ſome Body had helped Mr. *Rhind* to a *Greek* Concordance. For

[*m*] Exhortatur ne quis inter Miniſtros Verbi ſui quærat Præcellentiam et Poteſtatem. *Beza* in Locum.

1. *Peter* 5. 3. where Miniſters are forbidden to carry *as Lords over God's Heritage* the Original Word is the ſame. Thus you ſee all this Criticiſm is quite loſt. But why did not Mr. *Rhind*, when he was in the Criticizing Vein, obſerve, that though the compound *Verb* which *Matthew* and *Mark* uſe ſignifie ſometimes *Violence* and *Tyranny*; yet that *Luke* in the Parallel Place uſed the ſimple Verb, which, however it may be ſometimes applyed, yet in its own Nature ſignifies only *Dominion* without the Superaddition of *Tyranny* or *Violence*. Why, I ſay, did not Mr. *Rhind* obſerve this? The Reaſon is Plain, it would have made againſt him and quite ſpoiled his Argument; and why ſhould a Man harm himſelf?

6. He endeavours to make good his Gloſs on the Text by Criticizing on the Word *Euergetes* which our Tranſlators render *Benefactors*. 'If, *ſaith he* p. 57, theſe *Gentile* Princes, whom their mean 'Flatterers ſirnamed *Euergetes*, were *ſome* of them Guilty of Viol-'ence, then doubtleſs the Authority, which was exerciſed by thoſe 'who were ſo called, is meant to be Tyrannical, and, in that Re-'ſpect, 'tis that our Saviour forbids his Apoſtles to Copy after them. Now, that *ſome* of theſe who had this *Sirname* given them, did abuſe their Authority to the worſt of Purpoſes, he proves by the Inſtance of *Ptolemy* VII. King of *Egypt* ſirnamed *Euergetes* II, who was indeed a very ill Prince. This is a very deep Criticiſm. But in the *Firſt* Place who ſhall ſecure us that our Saviour ſo much as *alluded* to any of thoſe Princes that had born that *Sirname*, there being no hint thereof either in the Text or Context. 2*dly*, Be it that He did allude to them, yet who ſhall ſecure us, that it was to ſuch as were *ill* rather than ſuch as were *good* of them? But it is Nauſeous to diſpute againſt a Triffle, though there were other Princes whom their Flatterers upon Occaſion now and then called *Euergetes* or *Benefactors* in a Way of Complement, yet I do not find *any* that bore that for their *Sirname*, ſave two of the Race of the *Ptolemeys* in *Egypt*. And as the *Second* of them was very vitious, as Mr. *Rhind* has obſerved; ſo the *firſt* of them viz. the Son of *Ptolemey Philadelphus* was a brave Man, engaged in a Juſt War againſt *Antiochus Callinicus* for the Murder of his Siſter and her little Son, had Succeſs in it, and in Token of his Devotion and Gratitude offered Sacrifices to the God of Heaven at *Jeruſalem*. On which Account

Joſephus

Josephus (*n*) makes honourable Mention of him. Now, when there were only two Princes that bare that *Sirname*, whereof as the one was Bad, so the other was Good; why should Christ allude only to the *Ill* one? For, to affirm he did so, without proving it, is to beg the Question.

7. Mr. *Rhind* argues † from 'the Opposition, which our *Lord* states 'twixt his own Example which he proposes for their Imitation, and 'that of the Princes of the *Gentiles* which he forbids the Apostles to 'follow. It cannot, *saith he*, be said without Blasphemy, that he 'put himself upon a Level with his Apostles, with Respect to Au'thority and Jurisdiction; and consequently that Authority which 'they were to exercise, in Imitation of him, does not import, a per'fect Equality among them in Opposition to that Imparity which 'obtained in the Heathen Governments. The Answer is easie, Mr. *Rhind* has mistaken (whether willfully or otherwise I shall not determine) the Design of the Argument and the Way how it proceeds. For when our Lord commanded *ver.* 27. 28. 'Whoso'ever will be chief among you, let him be your Servant; even as 'the Son of Man came not to be ministred unto, but to minister, He argued from the *greater* to the *lesser* thus: For as much as *I your Lord and Master* have humbled my self to the basest Service, therefore *you who are indeed Servants, and each upon a Level with other*, should be ashamed to be thinking of or aspireing to be Lords and Masters over one another. This makes our Saviour's Words Plain and Intelligible, whereas Mr. *Rhind*'s Gloss, instead of extinguishing, would have enflamed their Ambition, by supposing it Lawfull for one or two of them to Lord it over the Rest.

8. 'Our Lord, *saith he ibid*, cannot be supposed to forbid in this 'Text such a Subordination of *Rulers* in the Church, as was that, 'which at that Time obtained in most of the *Gentile* States; see'ing this were to condemn that Form, by which he thought fit 'the Church should be governed in the Days of his Flesh, which 'was Monarchical. The Answer is short. 1. We have already heard M. *Sage* owning that there was no Christian Church in *Being* at that Time, consequently no Christian Governours, consequently

[n]. Contra Apion. Lib. II. p. [mihi] 844. Vide etiam Justin. Hist. Lib. XXVII. † p. 59.

no particular Form by which the Church was then governed. *2dly*, ſuppoſing both the *Twelve* and the *Seventy* had been Governours, yet we have heard Dr. *Whitby* confeſſing that they were both veſted with the *ſame* Power. There being then no Subordination of *Paſtors*, no different Orders of them under Chriſt at that Time, it neceſſarly follows that Chriſt's Words in the controverted Text, according to Mr. *Rhind*'s Peremptor Sentence p. 61, 'Doubtleſs, whatever Kind 'of Government obtain'd in the Church in the Days of Chriſt was 'deſigned to be perpetual, muſt needs condemn ſuch a Subordination in all Time coming.

Laſtly. Mr. *Rhind* argues p. 60. That if the Senſe of our Saviour's Words were not according to his Gloſs, 'tis probable he would have 'ſtated the Oppoſition, not 'twixt them and the Princes of the *Gentiles*; 'but rather 'twixt them and the High Prieſt, *Prieſt* and Levites a-'mong the Jews. 'Tis anſwered: Chriſt had the greateſt Reaſon to State the Oppoſition as he did. He had the greateſt Reaſon *not* to State it as Mr. *Rhind* thinks probable he would have done upon Suppoſition of the *Presbyterian* Senſe. Firſt, he did State the Oppoſition 'twixt them and the Princes of the *Gentiles*, becauſe the Diſciples having a Notion of a Temporal Kingdom of the *Meſſias*, and being ſwelled with the Expectation of Dignities in the Same; our Saviour thought it needfull to anſwer them agreeably to the Notion they had entertain'd, and withal to inſinuate to them that no one of them was to expect any Superiority over the reſt in any Capacity Civil or Eccleſiaſtical; but that they were all to be on a Level in Point of *Authority*. And thus in Fact we find afterwards they were, though indeed on the Account of *Perſonal Excellencies* ſome of them *ſeemed to be Pillars*. Secondly, He did *not* State the Oppoſition 'twixt them and the *Jewiſh* High Prieſt, Prieſts and Levites, becauſe the Diſciples themſelves did not yet think of any other Church Government than what at preſent obtained among the *Jews*; and Chriſt did not find them yet ripe for receiving any Intimation thereof; but thought it enough to give them a general Rule to be obſerved by them afterwards; and whereof, when it was to be put in Practice, they would eaſily conceive the Meaning, after *their Underſtandings were opened*, and Things *brought to their Remembrance* by the Holy Ghoſt which was to be communicated to them. This Thought is ſuggeſted to us by Mr. *Dod-*

well

well (o). 'The Apostles themselves, *saith he*, do not seem to have known 'any Thing concerning the Government of the Church till their 'Separation from the Synagogues; they were by Birth *Jews* and 'Zealous of the Law and Customes of their Fathers, and if our Lord 'before that, had revealed any Thing to them which looked that 'Way, that is *to a Change of Government*, they had been in Hazard 'of revolting from, instead of obeying him. And therefore our 'Lord dealt cautiously with them, and would not put new Wine 'into Old Bottles, nor while their Minds were yet alienated, bear 'in New Revelations upon them concerning Facts from which they 'would have had an Aversion.

And thus now I have considered every Thing Mr. *Rhind* has advanced upon that controverted Text; and I hope it sufficiently appears, that not *one* of his Thoughts, nay nor *all* of them jointly are of the least Force to wrest it from the *Presbyterians*, or to justifie the Glosse he has put upon it: For, besides all has been already suggested; that not only the *Tyrannical Exercise*, as Mr. *Rhind* would, but the *Dominion* it self too, as the Presbyterians would, is discharged by that Text, is evident both from the *Occasion* of it and likewise from our Saviour's *known Character*. *First*. From the *Occasion* of it which was the Mother of *Zebedee's* Children her asking a Boon for her Sons. How earnest soever she might be for their Promotion; unless we should suppose her to have been a Monster of Women, and another *Jezebel*, she could not have been so Impudent as to ask for them a Power of *Domineering Tyranically* over their Fellows. Could she have got them raised to the *Dominion*, no doubt she had been glad to see them manage it vertuously and with Temper and Moderation: But our Saviour would not allow the *Dominion* it self, and so there could be neither Place nor Temptation for the *Tyrannical Exercise* of it. *Secondly*. From our Saviour's *known Character*. He not only taught Loyalty and a Regard to the Civil Powers, but gave too a most bright and shineing Example of it in his Practice. Was it consistent with this Character to represent indefinitly (which is much the same Thing

[o] Parænes. Sect. 14. p. 58. Ante, secessam a synagogis, nec de regimine, nec de ipso secessu, ipsi rescivisse videntur Apostoli.--- Erant enim ipsi ortu Judæi, patriarumq; e consuetudinum legisque studiosi.--- Si quid antea patefeciset Dominus quod eo spectare crederetur; periculum erat ne deficerent potius quam parerent.--- Caute ergo egit Dominus, nec vinum novum vasis credidit veteribus, nec proinde alienis animis novas, de factis a quibus abhorrebant, ingessit Revelationes.

Thing with Universally) the whole Princes of the Earth as a Knot of Tyrants counteracting the Design of their Office which is the Good and Happiness of Mankind, by their Violence and Oppression? What else could have been the Effect of this, but to produce in his Followers an utter Aversion to Monarchy, and to make 'em all *State-Whiggs*? This Sense then is absurd, and therefore ought not to be put upon our Saviour's Words. And I cannot enough wonder how Mr. *Rhind* could stumble upon it. Had it dropt from some old *Republican*, the Matter had been the less; but in Mr. *Rhind*, who has made Loyalty so great a Part of Religion, and has recommended it to the World in so very pointed a *Sermon*, 'twas an unpardonable Escape. To confirm my Thoughts upon this Text, let us hear Dr. *Whitby* on it. 'Nor do I think, *saith he*, † Christ 'only hear forbiddeth such Dominion as is attended with Tyran-'ny, Oppression and Contempt of their Subjects. *First* because S. '*Luke* uses only the Simple Verbs which bear no such ill Sense. '2*dly*, Because Kings and Governours were not always guilty of 'this Male-Administration. And 3*dly*, Because Christ does not op-'pose unto their Government a just Dominion, but a Ministry 'only.

And now upon the Whole I referr it to the Reader, if the Argument for *Prelacy* from *its obtaining in* Christ's *Days* is not even Ridiculous; when the greatest Episcopal Writers own there was no Christian Church in *Being* at that Time, therefore no Subordination of Pastors in it, therefore no Prelacy. Or supposing the *Twelve* and the *Seventy* had been Church Officers, yet that they had both the *same* Power, and so it becomes an Argument for *Parity*.

† Annot. on *Matth.* XX. 23.

ART.

ARTICLE II.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Proof for the actual Institution of* Prelacy *from its being continued in the Days of the Apostles, and from a Succession in the Apostolate, and from its having been confirmed by* Miracles, *is examined. From* P. 61. *to* P. 74.

UPON this I shall I. Examine Mr. *Rhind*'s Transition, which is indeed very Remarkable. II. His general Reasonings from the *Acts* and *Epistles*. III. His particular Argument from a Succession in the Apostolate. IV. His Demonstration for the Divine Right of Prelacy from its being confirmed by Miracles.

I. I am to examine Mr. *Rhind*'s Transition, which is indeed very remarkable: I mean it would be so in any other Author, though it is very familiar with Mr. *Rhind*. He, presuming he had proved That our Saviour by His Authority established the Imparity he pleads for, contends, not only that that Establishment was not Abrogate afterwards, but that even Christ himself could not abrogate it: For, saith he p. 61, *it would reflect odiously upon his Wisdom to have settled a Government, which must be almost as soon altered as instituted.* It is indeed the known Character of the Generality of the Writers on the *Episcopal* Side, that they dictate their crude Notions with the same Masterfull Air as if they were demonstrating one of *Euclid*'s Propositions; yet generally this Positiveness amounts to no more than ill Manners, and therefore may either be neglected, or

or chaſtiſed with a little Raillery. But that a Nothing of a Creature ſhould at every Turn give Meaſures to the Divine Wiſdom is Inſupportable, and moſt of all in this Caſe. For *1ſt.* Who that has any Reverence for our Bleſſed Saviour will preſume to affirm that becauſe he uſed one Method for conſtituting the Church, therefore it was inconſiſtent with his Wiſdom to alter that Method in Governing Her when conſtituted? *2dly.* M. *Dodwell*, who has reaſoned in a *Mathematical* Chain, has very prolixly attempted to prove (*p*) That the Original Government of the Chriſtian Church not only *might* be, but actually *was* altered. Yea that the Epiſcopal *Conſtitution of Government, which now obtains, is later than all the Writings of the New Teſtament, and therefore is not to be ſought for there.* If it was not inconſiſtent with the Wiſdom of Chriſt to alter the Government of the Church from a *Papacy* to a meer *Prelacy*, why ſhould it be ſo to alter it from *Prelacy* to *Presbytry*? *3dly.* Mr. *Rhind* himſelf muſt needs confeſs that the Original Government of the Chriſtian Church is altered. For by his own Principles there were Biſhops in the Time of the Apoſtles; for Inſtance, He has declared p. 78. *Timothy* and *Titus* to have been *the ordinary and fixed Prelats of* Epheſus *and* Crete. Yet the Apoſtles were *then* Superiour to them. But *now* all Biſhops by Divine Right are Equal, and have no Superiour above them. If then it is conſiſtent enough with the Wiſdom of Chriſt that there ſhould be at this Day *Biſhops* without ſuperior Apoſtles, notwithſtanding it was otherwiſe at the Beginning, How is it inconſiſtent with his Wiſdom that there ſhould be *Presbyters* without ſuperior *Biſhops*? But then *Laſtly* to compleat all, If Mr. *Rhind*'s Aſſertion be true, then *Prelacy* is undone for ever. For it has been already proved from the *Epiſcopal* Writers of the beſt Note, that our Lord did not eſtabliſh an Imparity, that the *Twelve* were equal among themſelves, the *Seventy* among themſelves, and the *Twelve* and the *Seventy* compleatly equal without any Subordination of the latter to the former. If then the *firſt* Inſtitution could not be altered, Parity muſt obtain for ever.

II. I am to examine Mr. *Rhind*'s general Reaſonings from the *Acts* and

---

[p] Parænes. Sect. 13. p. 53. Hodierni Regiminis Eccleſiaſtici Conſtitutio, licet emanarit ab Apoſtolis, eſt tamen ſcriptis N. T. omnibus recentior, & proinde non ibi expectanda.

and *Epistles*. He cannot find in his Heart to enter on 'em till he have spent a *Page* the 62 in *Philippicks* against the *Presbyterians* for their *invincible Obstinacy* which will not yield even when he *levells Demonstrations* against them. Hard hearted Creatures they! But Mr. *Rhind* must e'en comfort himself with this, how small soever his Success is likely to be, that yet he is in the Way of his Duty. I shall give the Reader every Word of his *Reasonings*, that he may judge whether his Party must not be (to use his own Courtly Phrase) an *Implicite Herd* indeed that keeps it self in Countenance by them. The *Acts* and *Epistles*, saith he p. 63. *favour the Presbyterians as little as the four Gospells.* Nay, if they favour them as much, they are not likely to be great Losers. 'These *Acts* and *Epistles*, *adds he*, are so far from intimating that 'the first Establishment was altered by the Apostles, that on the contra-'ry they plainly shew its Continuance. Why then Adieu *Prelacy* for ever: For the first Establishment was only of the Apostles, they were the first Officers in the Church, for a while the only Officers, and still acted in a perfect Parity. 'Don't the *Acts* and *Epistles*, *proceeds he*, all 'along make Mention of several Orders of Men who were undisputed-'ly Church Officers, that is, who were solemnly separated for Ecclesias-'tical Offices by the Imposition of Hands? And don't they assign to 'each their Different Powers? I answer, not *all along*; for, as I have said just now, there was at first but *one* Order viz. that of the Apostles, and even these too solemnly separated for their Office without Imposition of Hands, at least we read nothing of it in the Scripture. *What*, he goes on, *does more frequently occur thro' these sacred Writings, than the Mention that is made of Presbyters and Deacons, the one Subordinate to the other, and of the Apostles Paramount to them all.* 'Tis answered. There is indeed frequent Mention of *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, the one Subordinate to the other, and of the Apostles Paramount to them all, but how came he to lose *Prelats* in his Enumeration, who ought to have been inserted 'twixt the Apostles and Presbyters? Were there none such in the Days of the Apostles? If not, what hath the Church to do with them now? If there were, why did he drop them in his Catalogue in this Place when he averrs it afterward, tho' at the Distance of 16 *Pages*, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were *the ordinary and fixed Prelats of* Ephesus *and* Crete. The Reason of this Artifice is obvious. The inserting *Prelats* here would have quite spoiled his Reasoning; it would have made four Orders of Officers in the Apostolick Times,

viz. Apoſtles, Prelats, Presbyters and Deacons, and if there ought to be as many different Orders *now* as there were at *firſt*, which is the Scope of Mr *Rhind*'s Reaſoning, and without which it ſignifies nothing; then *Prelacy* is loſt: For they have but *three* different Orders among them viz. Prelats, Presbyters and Deacons, for which they do ſo much as pretend *Divine* Right. But to go on with Mr. *Rhind*'s Reaſonings. What though the *Acts* and *Epiſtles* make Mention of the different and Subordinate Orders of Apoſtles, Presbyters and Deacons, what follows? *Why*, ſaith he, *could one wiſh a clearer Proof than this, to evince that there was then an Imparity among Church Officers.* I anſwer, none. For every *Presbyterian* owns that there was *then* viz. in the Days of the Apoſtles an Imparity not only among the Church Officers, but Paſtors too. No doubt the Apoſtles were ſuperior to the *Presbyters*. But he has a *Second* Inference to make viz. 'That the 'ſame alſo is a moſt clear *Proof* that that Imparity was of Divine In-'ſtitution. The *Presbyterians* grant it: For the Apoſtles were certainly acted by the Divine Spirit. His *Third* Inference which compleats the whole is, *that conſequently that Imparity* viz. of Paſtors, *ought to be ſtill continued.* But here the *Presbyterians* and Mr. *Rhind* part Ways: for, tho' the *Presbyterians* acknowledge that the Apoſtles were ſuperior to the *Presbyters*; Yet they affirm that a Superiority among Paſtors is unlawfull *now*, becauſe the Apoſtolate was an *extrordinary* Office not to be continued, the Apoſtles *extraordinary* Officers not to be ſucceeded to, except in the Ordinary Functions, Preaching, Diſpenſing the Sacraments and Governing the Church, in which they are ſucceded to by every Miniſter. And this brings me to examine

III. His particular Argument from a Succeſſion in the Apoſtolate. He expreſly denys p. 64 &c that 'the Apoſtolate was an extraordi-'nary Office, *or* that the Apoſtolick Government was Temporary, '*and aſſerts that* the Biſhops of the Church, *meaning* Prelats *as ſuperior* '*to Presbyters*, do ſucceed them therein. Is this true? *Firſt*, *Davenant* Biſhop of *Sarum* not only denys but diſproves it (*q*), Multitudes of others of the Church of *England* do the ſame. The Church of *Rome* a Society of a very large Extent, of a long Standing, and ſuch as has produced not a few Wiſe and Great Men expreſly contradict it, denying

[q] In Coloſs. p. 45.

ing that any of the Apostles had Successors save *Peter* in the Papal Chair. *Secondly.* Which must conclude Mr. *Rhind*, M. *Dodwell* (*r*) Himself has denyed it, and asserts that *the Office of the* Apostolate *failed with the last Apostle, and that never any of them had a Successor but* Judas *the Traitor.* Did this escape M. *Dodwell* through Inadvertency? He repeats it over and over and over again in different Places. But *Thirdly*, which is worst of all, *Ignatius* himself, who is both Stem and Stern of the Episcopal Cause *always* makes the Presbyters to succeed to and represent the Apostles, but the Bishops *never.* (*s*) 'I exhort 'you that you study to do all Things in a Divine Concord, the 'Bishop presiding in the place of God, your Presbyters in the Place 'of the Council of the Apostles. (*t*) Also be subject to your Presby- 'ters as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ our Hope. (*v*) Reverence the 'Presbyters as the Sanhedrim of God and College of the Apostles. (*x*) 'Continue inseparable from Jesus Christ our God and from the Bi- 'shop and from the Commands of the Apostles. He that does any 'Thing without the Bishop and Presbyters and Deacons is not 'pure in his Conscience. (*y*) Follow your Bishop, as Jesus 'Christ the Father, and the Presbytry as the Apostles. I hope then this Matter is abundantly Plain, so far as human Testimony is needfull. But then *Lastly.* If to all this we add the Judgment of the Scripture, it may be put beyond Doubt. I am indeed amazed to find any Man who has read the *first* Chapter of the *Acts* of the *Apostles* plead for a continued Succession in the Apostolick Office. *Judas* had disposed of Himself, and the Vacancy was now to be supplied; the requisits necessary for qualifying one to stand Candidate for the Place are set down *Vers.* 21. 22. 'Wherefore of these Men which 'have Companied with us, all the Time that the Lord Jesus went in 'and out among us: Beginning from the Baptism of John, unto 'that same Day He was taken up from us, must one be ordain'd to 'be a Witness with us of His Resurrection. In which Words we are plainly told that none could succeed into the Apostolate, but such as had known Jesus before His Death, and seen Him after His

[r] Defecerat cum ultimo Apostolo etiam Apostolatus officium; cum nulli unquam præterquam Judæ proditori, sufficerentur Apostolorum successores. Paræneſ. Sect. 6. p. 11. Sect. 15. p. 62. Sect. 16. p. 68. [s] Ep. to the *Magnes.* Sect. 5. [t] Ep. to the *Trall.* Sect. 2. [v] Ibid. Sect. 3. [x] Ibid. Sect. 7. [y] Ep. to the *Smyrnæans.* Sect. 7. Edit. 1st 1693. by Dr. *Wake.*

Reſurrection and at His Aſcenſion. If any Man now living, Biſhop or any other, can be found thus qualified, we are content He be eſteem'd a Succeſſor in the Apoſtolate, but otherwiſe it is a very ſhameleſs Thing to talk of it.

But Mr. *Rhind* is of a different Judgment, and therefore is reſolved at any rate to diſprove the Aſſertion, *that the Apoſtolate was an extraordinary Office*, or *that the Apoſtolick Government was Temporary*. I ſhall examine what He has advanced for this Purpoſe.

Firſt. He will not allow it to have been extraordinary or Temporary upon *any* Account, becauſe it was not ſo upon *one* particular Account, viz. *The* Apoſtles *being bleſſed with extraordinary Gifts*. The Reader may poſſibly ſuſpect that I miſrepreſent Him; but take it in His own Words. 'The Apoſtles, *ſaith He p.* 64. were indeed 'bleſſed with ſundry extraordinary Gifts, which proves them to 'have been extraordinary Perſons; and it was highly neceſſary 'They ſhould be ſuch. But it does not at all follow from this, that 'the Apoſtolate was an extraordinary Office, or that the Apoſtolick 'Government was Temporary-- ------. But who can diſcern the leaſt Shadow of an Argument in this? Where is the *Presbyterian* who ever ſaid that theſe extraordinary Gifts wherewith the Apoſtles were bleſſed are *alone* an Argument that Their Office was extraordinary? What *Presbyterian* ever denyed that Presbyters and Deacons, yea and ſome of the Laity were ſometimes bleſſed with Them? The *Presbyterians* own theſe extraordinary Gifts were neceſſary for the ſucceſsfull Diſcharge of the Apoſtolick Office, They own that ſome of 'em were peculiar to the Apoſtles, particularly the giving of the Holy Ghoſt in His extraordinary *Chariſmata*; but beſides theſe They had an *immediat Call*, an *univerſal Commiſſion*, and were under an *infallible Conduct*, all which concurred to make them extraordinary Officers, and in which every Body ſees They neither are nor can be ſucceeded to. If any one now in Being can lay claim to theſe Characters, we ſhall allow Him to be a Succeſſor to the Apoſtles, and even diſpenſe with the other extraordinary Gifts.

Notwithſtanding this Reaſoning of His was ſo ill founded, yet He goes on to harangue upon it. 'If, *ſaith he ibid.* the *Presbyterians* 'will have theſe extraordinary Gifts to be an Argument of an extraordinary Office, yet muſt they at the ſame Time grant, that

that

'that Office should continue as long as these Gifts were Necessary, 'at least as long as they actually lasted. And upon this Concession He attempts to prove *p.* 67. 68. by the Instance of *Melito* Bishop of *Sardis*, *Irenæus* Bishop of *Lyons*, *Gregory* the Wonder-Worker Bishop of *Neocæsaria*, *Cyprian* Bishop of *Carthage*, and by the Testimony of *Eusebius* that these Extraordinary Gifts lasted for several Ages; and from thence inferrs that consequently *Episcopacy* must have lasted so long. *This Reasoning*, saith He, *is good enough*, ad Hominem, *and does sufficiently expose the Weakness of the Presbyterian Evasion.* But it is neither good *ad Hominem* nor *ad Rem*, nor exposes any Thing but Mr. *Rhind*'s Want of Arguments. *First* it is not Good *ad Hominem*: For the *Presbyterians* make no such Evasion; as we have already heard. Nor *Secondly* is it good *ad Rem*: For the Instances of Miraculous Bishops which He has insisted on are very Injudiciously chosen. I do not deny that extraordinary Gifts were continued in the Church even down to the *Third* or *Fourth* Century, or longer if Mr. *Rhind* Please; but then, so far as relates to their having been possessed by *Bishops*, He has had the ill luck to pitch upon the most suspected Instances. *First.* As for *Melito.* This was the Eunuch who was Bishop of *Sardis.* I shall easily believe what *Tertullian* as cited by S. *Jerom* and *Polycrates* as cited by *Eusebius* say of Him viz. *That He was a Man Divinly inspired, and in all Things directed by the Afflatus and Suggestion of the Holy Ghost*, if no more be meant thereby, than *that He was a Man of eminent Piety*: For the Spirit of Christ dwells and acts in every Man that is Christ's: And I think 'tis plain *Polycrates* in *Eusebius* meant no More: For he says only that *He was led in all Things by the Grace of the Holy Spirit.* But if Mr. *Rhind* will needs have us to understand thereby, that *He was in all Things under an infallible Conduct*, I assure Him I do not believe it: For the Apostles themselves were not always so; even *Peter* sometimes stept awry, and walked not with a straight Foot *Gal.* 2. 14, and I hope to make Mr. *Rhind* Himself confess that Good *Melito* was wrong in some Things. The Church of *England* never keeps *Easter* upon the Day of the full Moon, but upon the *Sunday* after, when it falls upon a *working Day*; or that Day seven-night, when it falls upon a *Sunday.* But *Melito* always kept *Easter* after the *Jewish* Fashion upon the very Day of the full Moon, whether it

it fell on *Sunday* or *Saturday* &c. and *Polycrates* in *Eusebius* cites Him for that very Purpose in Opposition to Pope *Victor*. 'Tis Plain then that *Melito* was sometimes Wrong, or the Church of *England* is. Mr. *Rhind* may chuse as likes Him best. *Secondly*, As for *Irenæus* Bishop of *Lyons*. Mr. *Rhind* saies that *He converted many Pagans in his Dioceß by the Miracles which He wrought*, but He has not instanced any of them, nor told us where the Relation of them is to be found, and I am not willing to condescend, lest I should be suspected to do it too favourably for my Self. He tells us indeed both from *Irenæus* Himself and *Eusebius* that *miraculous Gifts and Powers were very Common in His Time*; but what saies this to *Irenæus*'s Share in Them? When Mr. *Rhind* is more particular I shall be so too. *Thirdly*, As for *Cyprian*. All that Mr. *Rhind* alledges is, that *He assures us concerning Himself that He was blessed with uncommon Measures of the Divine Spirit*, and so I believe is every Good Christian, and do think Mr. *Rhind* was very Wise in not being more particular upon *Cyprian*'s Miraculous Gifts. But then *Lastly*, *Gregory Thaumaturgus* or the Wonder-Worker is Mr. *Rhind*'s great Man, yea even a Second *Moses* for Miracles. Well, what Vouchers does He bring for them? Two indeed of a very great Name viz. *Gregory Nyssen* in the *Life* of the Wonder-Worker, and S. *Basil de Spiritu Sancto* Cap. 29. But what Credit is to be given to them? In the first place hear the great *Spanheim* (z). 'The Learned, 'saith He, deservedly doubt about the Canonical Epistle ascribed 'to the *Wonder-Worker*. But much more about the Prodigies and 'Miracles which, almost without End, are attributed to Him by '*Nyssen* in His *Life* and by *Basil* Himself; whence He got the 'Name of the *Wonder-Worker* and another *Moses*. Certainly many 'Things in *Nyssen* breath the Credulity even of an old Wife. Thus *Spanheim*. 2dly, *Erasmus*, in the Epistle Dedicatory prefixed to *Basil*'s Works, rejects the latter half of His Book *de Spiritu Sancto* as Spurious, and at the end of *Cap.* 14. observes on the Margin, *that here the Author Changes*. Consequently the 29. Chapter which

[z] Introd. ad Hist. Nov. Test. Sect. III. p. 332. De Epistola Canonica eidem ad scripta, merito ambigunt Eruditi. At multo magis de prodigijs et miraculis, propemodum sine fine, quæ illi a *Nysseno* in ejus vita, et Passim a *Basilio* ipso &c tribuuntur. Unde *Thaumaturgi* nomen et alterius *Mosis*. Multa certe apud Nyssenum anilem quandam credulitatem spirant.

which Mr. *Rhind* insists on is of no Credit. 3dly *Coke* a Church of *England* Divine and sometime Fellow of *Brazen Nose* College, *Oxford*, proves (*a*) from the Body it self of that 29. *Chapter* that it is Spurious. And Lastly, which is worst of all, *Dodwell* Himself (*b*) reprobates these Dreams and Miracles of the *Wonder-Worker*. Was not now Mr. *Rhind* very well provided with Miracle-working Bishops when these were the best He could pitch on.

Secondly. Mr. *Rhind* having vainly spent *ten* Pages in pleading for a Succession in the Apostolate without the least Limitation, or dropping so much as one Syllable for explaining himself; at length p. 70. He tells us; that by 'the Apostolick Office, abstracting from it all 'Accidentals, *he means* that Superiority of Power with which the 'Apostles were invested in the Ordination of Inferior Church 'Officers, and in Governing them and the Church: *And pleads* 'that it was not extraordinary in this Respect; and as such to cease. But the Prelats (supposing there were *then* any such) were *Church Officers inferior* to the Apostles, the Apostles were invested with a *Superiority of Power* in the Ordination of *them*. I ask now whether that *Superiority* was Ordinary or extraordinary. If *Ordinary*, then there ought still to be Officers *Superior* to Bishops. If *extraordinary*, then the *Superiority of Power* with which the Apostles were invested in the Ordination of Inferior Church Officers, and in Governing them and the Church must be *extraordinary* too. I challenge Mr. *Rhind* and all his Party to take off this by a sufficient Answer.

Thirdly, He argues p. 72. 'If that Form by which the Church 'was governed in the Days of the Apostles, be in all Respects 'as good, and in many undeniably better than any other, then 'I think I may safely conclude, that it never ought to be altered. If Mr. *Dodwell*'s Judgement be of any Weight, then this Reasoning is horridly false: For he teaches (*c*) That the Form of Government which obtained in the Days of the Apostles was altered, notwithstanding

---

[*a*] Censura quorundam Script. vet. p. 123. [*b*] Differt. IV. in Cypr. Num. 16. [*c*] Paræneſ. Sect. 39. p. 180. 181. Dum Colligendæ essent et plantandæ Ecclesiæ, admodum utilis erat Primatus ille Ecclesiæ, Hierosolymitanæ:-------Et quo latius Collegij Apostolici et Episcopi Hierosolymitani patuit auctoritas (dum eam prorsus infallibilem esse constabat) eo erat etiam utilior bono Ecclesiarum omnium publico. Id sane docet Hegesippus, tanti per Hæreticos prodire in publicum non Ausos, Dum unius Ecclesiæ sententia Damnati, spes nulla deinde esset ut ab aliqua alia ecclesia reciperentur.------ Et quidem ad fidem propagandam utilior erat unius ecclesiæ autoritas quæ aliarum omnium longe lateque Dominaretur.

notwithstanding that it was better calculate for *gathering* and *planting* Churches, for *suppressing Heresies*, for *propagating the Faith*, for the *publick Good of all the Churches*, than that which took place afterward.

Lastly. 'If, *saith He* p. 72, the *Presbyterian* were designed to be 'the Standing Form of Church Government, it wou'd seem *to* 'reflect disparagingly *on the Wisdom of Christ and his Apostles*, that they 'could not make it serve all the Purposes for which such a Govern-'ment ought to be appointed; but that to supply its Defects, they must 'usher it in with a Form, not only inconsistent with it, but which 'also in After Ages wou'd be declared an unsupportable Yoke. Is 'it to be supposed, if they had foreseen that *Parity* would be ever 'after the fittest Form of Government in the Church, or that it 'cou'd be usefull in it, that any other wou'd have at all obtain'd? 'No. Or was there any Necessity that any other should obtain? 'Doubtless none at all. Is not this a very mannerly Harangue? Mr. *Rhind* must Discipline both Christ and his Apostles into their Duty, and teach them what was Consistent with their Wisdom, what would *reflect disparaginly* upon it. But admitting it were *mannerly*, Is there any *Truth* in it? No, not one Syllable even according to the Principles of his own Master the Great *Dodwell*, according to whom the Apostles did not appoint *Several* Orders of Men, as Mr. *Rhind* alledges, for the Work of the Ministry, but *one* Order only viz. of Simple Presbyters. Plainly Mr. *Dodwell*'s Account of the Matter is this, 'That the Bishop of *Jerusalem* (*as we* 'have *already observed*) was Primate of the Christian Church all the 'World over. That the Church of *Jerusalem* by her Itinerant Mis-'sionaries exerced the whole Discipline in all the Christian World (*d*). 'That these Itinerant Missionaries (*e*) whether Apostles or others, 'were *extraordinary* Officers. That wherever they came, they ne-'ver ordained any Bishops but Simple *Presbyters* only with a *Chair-'Man* among them for Orders sake; all which had indeed a *Power* of

[d] Hæc ergo, cum ita se habuerint, facile inde colligimus, unicum fuisse, in hoc universo intervallo, Christianis omnibus unitatis Principium, Episcopum *Hierosolymitanum*.---- Primis autem temporibus vix fere alii potestatem in obnoxias Ecclesiæ *Hierosolymitanæ* Ecclesias exercuerunt quam Ecclesiæ *Hierosolymitanæ*, Ministri missi *Hierosolymis* ad res eorum in partibus remotioribus procurandas. *Parænes.* Sect. 10. p. 30, 32. [e] Nam ab *Extraordinariis* ubique constituta sunt Ecclesiarum exterarum Presbyteri, *Extraordinariorum* autem Rectorum summos sacræ litteræ ipsæ agnoscunt Apostolos. *Ibid.*

'of preaching the Word, and dispensing the Sacraments, but neither they nor their *Chairman* were to touch the Government with one of their Fingers. Plainly 'they had no Power to exauctorate or de-'pose any of their Number how Criminal soever, nor to surrogate 'new Presbyters in Place of such as dyed, nor to exclude any from 'the Communion, nor to restore such as had been excluded though 'never so penitent (*f*).

This Establishment continued till after the Destruction of *Jerusalem* and the Death of *Simeon* the Son of *Cleophas*. At length about the Year CVI. the Name of *Bishop* before common to all Presbyters was appropriate to one in each Presbytry. *And this was the first Year*, saies he †. of *Setling Episcopacy*.

The Bishop thus set up was, if we will believe Mr. *Dodwell*, endued with a swingeing Power indeed. 'The dispensing all Rewards 'and Punishments in the Christian Society was in his Hands A-'LONE; in his Hands was the WHOLE Government, and that 'Legislative Power that is Competent to the Church and that with-'out a RIVAL or Mate (*g*). Yea so uncontroulable was his Power, that tho' he might cast himself out of the Church by his *Schism*, *Heresie* or *Sacrificeing to Idols*; in which Case the Episcopal College might supply his Place with another, yet it was not in the Power of that College, much less of his Presbyters, nay not of any Creature to depose him, how Immoral soever he were in his Life, how ill soever he governed the Church, but he was to be left to the Judgment of God alone (*h*). This was the *Ignatian*, this the *Cyprianick* Bishop, this the Episcopacy that *shou'd* always obtain (*i*).

(*f*) Paræneſ. Sect. 10. p. 32. 33. Munijs ſane Eccleſiarum publicis obeundis ita vacabat, ut tamen Diſciplinæ partem nullam aut Regiminis adminiſtrarint. Nec legimus unquam ab his Eccleſiarum Presbyteris ſeu exauctoratos, cum ita mererentur, Presbyteros; ſeu novos in Demortuorum loca ſuffectos. Nec pulium aliquem Communione, nec horum Presbyteriorum decreto reſtitutum.

† Ibid. *Sect.* 23. p. 102. Non longe, ut opinor, aberrabimus ſi Annum Conſtituti Epiſcopatus primordialem ſtatuamus Chriſti CVI. ut ſcilicet fuerit Anno illo paulo vel Antiquior vel Recentior.

(*g*) Ibid. *Sect.* 37. p. 176. Sic penes SOLUM Epiſcopum erunt ſocietatis Chriſtianæ Præmia omnia atque Pœnæ. Inde ſequetur penes eundem eſſe viſibilis Eccleſiæ Regimen OMNE, Poteſtatemque, qualis in hac Societate locum habet, Legislatuiam. Et quidem ſine ÆMULO.

[*h*] Ibid. *Sect.* 42. p. 192. Nec opus erat Judice qui eum exuat, ſed quo ſedes illius antea vacua ſupplea-tur. Tale Crimen erat Idolis ſacrificaſſe.---. Tale Crimen erat Hæreſis.-- Similis erat cauſa Sciſmatis.-- Itaque ſenten.ia nulla opus eſt quæ illos ejiciat ex Eccleſia, vel exuat Officio. Hucuſque ergo nulli eſt Poteſtas in Epiſcopos. Sed vero nullas legimus his temporibus Epiſcoporum depoſitiones propter Crimina quæ non Poteſtatem ipſam Epiſcopalem ſuſtulerint. Nullas propter Morum vitia ſola. Nullas propter Eccleſiam male adminiſtratam. [*i*] *Ibid. Sect.* 37. p. 176. Recte ergo ſine Epiſcopo Eccleſiam nequidem eſſe poſſe cenſuit *Ignatius Sect.* 40. p. 186. ſupremos enim, in ſua quemque Ditione, Chriſtoque SOLI obnoxios Epiſcopos agnoſcit ibi S *Cyprianus. Sect.* 54. p. 240. Bono fieret Reformationis publico, ſi Epiſcopi primævis illorum Juribus reſtaurentur.

I am fully perfwaded that this *Dodwellian* Scheme, ſo far as it Narrates the Powers of Biſhops, is the moſt extravagant, chimerical and falſe; yea indeed the moſt ſcandalous to Chriſtianity that ever was or perhaps will be heard of; but let his Followers look to that the beſt Way they can: Only 'tis plain that, ſo far as M. *Dodwell*'s Judgment or Authority reaches, Mr. *Rhind*'s Argument is utterly loſt: And the *Firſt* Form of Government certainly *might* be altered; becauſe, by the preceeding Scheme, it actually *was* altered. I am then longing after this Repreſentation to hear what Judgment Mr. *Rhind* will paſs upon his above Reaſonings.

I ſhould now proceed to the next Particular, but I crave leave e're I go further to make an Obſerve or two.

In the Firſt Place I obſerve that there is nothing the *Epiſcopal* Authors, and Mr. *Rhind* as much as any, more frequently and willingly ſlide into than Harangues againſt a Government by *Parity*. Here they lay out all their Colours, exert their utmoſt Eloquence, and even bear down their Reader with a Torrent of Rhetorick. But I hope by this Time the Reader is abundantly convinced that theſe ſame Harangues againſt *Parity* are very ſenſeleſs Things. For, *Firſt*, by the former Account from M. *Dodwell* we have heard that *Presbyters* had not the leaſt Share in the Government, and that the WHOLE Government was in the Biſhop's Hands, and in his ALONE. *Secondly*, the ſame M. *Dodwell* aſſures us, and he is certainly right in it, that all Biſhops were originally equal. By Divine Right are ſo, and continued to be ſo till towards the Reign of *Conſtantine* the Great that *Archbiſhops* and *Metropolitans* were brought in, not upon any Divine Warrant, but by Factions among themſelves (*k*). *Thirdly*, he aſſures us in like Manner, that the Church in each Nation and Province was governed by the Epiſcopal College (*l*), and that too acting in a *Parity*. *Fourthly*, 'That the ſaid *Parity* of all 'Biſhops (*m*) was moſt conſiſtent even with a flouriſhing Diſci-'pline both of *Faith* and *Manners*, and that the very *Parity* it ſelf would

[k] *Paræneſ. Sect.* 40. p. 184. Sequitur ergo, quæcunque deinceps obtinuerit Imparitas, eam omnem ſingulorum Epiſcoporum pactis eſſe tribuendum, tantundemque valere quantum illa valent pacta. Quamdiu obtinuerit *Paritas* ſtatuere difficile eſt, tot primævis monumentis deperditis. Suſpicor autem obtinuiſſe ad tempora fere *Conſtantini*. (l) *One Prieſthood.* Preface. *Sect.* 8. (m) *Paræneſ.* Sect. 35. Sic nihil obſtabit quo minus, in hac ipſa Epiſcoporum omnium *Paritate*, vigeat tamen Diſciplina tam Fidei, quam Morum, conſentientiſſima *Paritas* certe *ipſa* lites illas omnes ablatura erat, quæ e Typho ſeculari, ex æmulatione, vel ex invidia ſæpe oriuntur, &c.

'would take away all these Contentions which often arise from 'Worldly Pride, Emulation or Envy. Is it not then plain that the Government of the Church Universal, and the Government of every National Church was and ought to be by *Parity*? And what then signifie all their Declamations against *Parity*? Will they not equally serve the *Presbyterians* against an *Episcopal* Parity, as they do the *Episcopalians* against a *Presbyterian* Parity? Or is *Parity* so Nimble a thing as to alter its Nature according as the Side is that espouses it? I would then advise our Episcopal Brethren to reserve their Harangues on that Subject till they hear of a new Edition of the *Formulæ Oratoriæ*; for though they import nothing in the Controversie of Church Government, yet they may be worth their Room *there*; and possibly be usefull to some School Boy of a Barren Fancy to furnish out his *Oration* with.

In the *Second* Place, What a very Jest do the greatest Authors on the Episcopal Side make themselves. Dr. *Hammond* in innumerable Places *(n)* will have us believe that the Apostles at first ordained no *Meer Presbyters* but *Bishops* only. No, saith Mr. *Dodwell*, the Apostles at first ordain'd no *Bishops* but *simple Presbyters* only. Here are the two greatest Champions of the Cause by the Ears together on the most Material Point of the Controversie. What can the *Presbyterians* do in the mean while but gather the Spoil, which, I think, very plainly falls to their Share which soever of 'em two gains the Victory. For if Dr. *Hammond* be right, the *Presbyterians* cannot be Wrong; a *Bishop* without *Presbyters* under Him being the likest Thing in the World to a *Presbyterian* Minister. But if Mr. *Dodwell* is right, the *Presbyterians* clearly gain the Cause; there being no Mention of *Episcopal* Government in the New Testament; and the Year of Christ CVI being the *first* year of its Setlement. For my own Part I am perfectly convinced that the Apostles ordain'd no *Presbyters* but such as were *Bishops* too in the full Scripture extent of that Word, that is, who had Power of *Ordaining*, exercising *Discipline* and *Governing* the Church as well as of *Preaching* and dispensing the *Sacraments*. But that these *Bishops* had (as Dr. *Hammond* fancies) a Power of *Ordaining* under themselves *Sim-*

[n] Dis. 4. Cap. 19, 20, 21, 22. Vind. of the Dis. Chap. 2. Annot. on Act. 11. *b* and 14. *a*.

ple Presbyters as they call them, that is, Men impowered to *Preach* and Dispense the *Sacraments*, which is the worthier Part of the Office, and on the Account of which especially the *double Honour* is due; without Power of *Ordaining* and *Governing*, which is the lesser Part of the Office, I shall believe it when I see it proved. In the mean Time I am not more perswaded that there is such a Book as the Bible, than I am that there is no mention in it of any such Creature as a *Simple Presbyter* or of a Power lodged in the Hands of a *Bishop* to make any such; or that there is in all the Kingdom a *Presbyterian* Minister who is not as much a *Bishop*, in all that Sense the New Testament means the Word, as the Primate of all *England* is. I now proceed to Examine.

IV. His Demonstration for the *Divine* Right of *Prelacy* from its being confirmed by *Miracles*. The Reader heard before of Mr. *Rhina*'s Miracle Working Bishops. This He tells us p. 69. *has given him the Hint of a Thing which in* His *Opinion is a* Plain Demonstration *for Episcopacy*; which is this in His own Words.

'Seeing after that Time, in which a Proper Episcopacy is acknowledged to have universally obtain'd, several (whom the Adversaries of that venerable Order cannot deny to have been Bishops in the Ordinary acceptation of that Term) were allowed the Gifts of the Holy Ghost; 'tis certain that Their Office was of Divine Institution For it is not to be supposed that our Lord wou'd have vouchafed them these special Donatives of Heaven, which they employed in the Discharge of the Episcopal Office, had it been (what the Presbyterians commonly call it) an Antichristian Usurpation. Thus, if the Office of an Apostle be of Divine Institution, that of a Bishop must be so too, the Credentials for the Mission of Both being of the same Authority. This is His Demonstration

I do not wonder to find Mr. *Dodwell* (*o*) hint at this Argument; his Scheme had need of it: For he ingenuously owns that *Episcopacy* is not to be found in the New Testament; nor indeed can be, as *being*

[o] Parænes. Sect. 17. p. 74. Erant præterea, illo quoque Seculo Dona Spiritus S. & Miracula illustria, quæ Deum sub illa quque Disciplina præsentissimum probarint. Quæ sane Operari non poterant, si ab Antichristo & Iniquitatis Mysterio mutatio tanta processisset, quod volunt Nuperi Magistri.

ing later than all the Writings thereof. But for Mr. *Rhind* who was so well furnished with Arguments from the Scripture, to oppress us with these and with *Miracles* too was very unmercifull. However seeing he will needs go upon the Topick of *Miracles* and *extraordinary Gifts*, I think it but reasonable that *Presbytry* should put in for its Share. Bishop *Spotswood* himself relates (*p*) of *John Knox*, that he prophesied of *Thomas Maitland* a younger Brother of *Lethington*'s, who had insulted upon the Murder of the good Regent *Murray*, That *he should die where none should be to lament him.* And the Prophesie was literally accomplished. He relates also (*q*) that he foretold of the Earl of *Morton* That *his End should be with Shame and Ignominy* if he did not mend his Manners; which the Earl remembred at the Time of his Execution, and said 'that he found these Words to be true and 'of *John Knox* therein to be a Propher. He relates also (*r*) how he prophesied that the Laird of *Grange should be pulled out of his Nest, and his Carcase hang before the Sun*, which accordingly came to pass. He relates also (*s*) a Couple of Miraculous Providences interposed in behalf of M. *John Craig* another *Presbyterian* Minister. Twenty other Things, as miraculous and at least as well attested as these of *Melito*, *Irenæus*, or *Gregory* might be related of other *Presbyterian* Ministers; but for the greater Credit, I have satisfied my self with these recorded by the *Episcopal* Historian.

In the mean Time I am fully convinced that there cannot be a greater Weakness than to bring such Things in Argument on the one Side or the other. Had ever a *Bishop* or any Body else come and preached to the World that *Episcopacy* is of Divine Right, and that all the Passages of the New Testament relating to Church-Government are to be understood in a Sense consistent with that Doctrine, and had offered to work a Miracle for Confirmation of all this. Had the Event Answered, and an unconteste-ed Miracle been wrought; I acknowledge it might have superseded all other Arguments, and put an End to all further Disputes. But I suppose it will puzle Mr. *Rhind* to find where this was ever done; nay which is a great unhappiness to him, by his Account such a Miracle

[*p*] Church Hist. p. 234. [*q*] Ibid. p. 264. [*r*] Ibid. p. 266. [*s*] Ibid. p. 462.

Miracle in thoſe early Days had been unneceſſary; becauſe no Body then was in any Doubt about the *Divine* Right of *Prelacy*: No *Calvin* was not born for many hundreds of Years after; nay, *Aerius* himſelf that Father of *Presbyterian* Schiſmaticks was yet ſleeping in his Original Cauſes. There are ſeveral good Proteſtants that do not think that all the Miracles reported to be wrought by the *Jeſuits* in their Miſſions among the Pagans are meer Forgeries. If there was any Thing real in Them, it was a Seal to the Truth of Chriſtianity in General which was the great avowed End of their Miſſion. But will any Body inferr thence that the Order of the *Jeſuits* is of Divine Inſtitution? *Balaam* was endued with Extraordinary Gifts, does it therefore follow that God approved of his Character as a *Diviner* or *Soothſayer*? *Cyprian*, diſcourſing of ſome who had broken off the Church by Schiſm, yet ſuppoſes it poſſible for Them to ſignalize themſelves by Miracles (*t*). In like Manner *Auguſtin*. 'Let no Man, ſaith he (*v*), vend Fables a-'mong you. Both *Pontius* wrought a Miracle, and *Donatus* pray-'ed and God anſwered him from Heaven. Firſt either They are 'deceived themſelves, or elſe They deceive others. However ſuppoſe 'he *could remove Mountains*, yet, ſaith the Apoſtle, *If I have not 'Charity I am nothing*. Let us ſee whether he hath not Charity, 'I ſhould have believed it, if he had not divided the Unity: For 'my God hath warned me againſt all ſuch Wonder-mongers ſay-'ing *In the latter Days there ſhall ariſe falſe Prophets doing Signs and 'Wonders*. Thus *Auguſtin*. Here then is one *Demonſtration* for *Epiſcopacy* fairly ſpoiled. But as it is not the Firſt, ſo it is not likely to be the Laſt.

ART.

---

[t] *Cyprian* de Unitat. Eccleſiæ. Nam & prophetare, & Dæmona excludere, & Virtutes magnas in terris facere, ſublimis utique & admirabilis res eſt; non tamen Regnum cœleſte conſequitur quiſquis in his omnibus invenitur, niſi recti & juſti Itineris obſervatione [h. e. *Unitatis Eccleſiæ*] gradiatur. [v] *Auguſtinus* Tom. IX. Tract. 13. in Evan. *Joan.* p. 122. Nemo ergo vobis fabulas vendat. *Et* Pontius *fecit miraculum*, & Donatus *oravit & reſpondit ei Deus de Cœlo.* Primo aut falluntur aut fallunt. Poſtremo fac illum montes transferre. Charitatem autem, inquit, non habeam, nihil ſum. Videamus utrum habuerit Charitatem. Credrem, ſi non diviſiſſet Unitatem. Nam & contra iſtos, ut ſic loquar, mirabiliarios cautum me fecit Deus meus, Dicens; In noviſſimis temporibus exſurgent Pſeudoprophetæ, facientes ſigna & portenta.

ARTICLE III.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Proof for the Institution of* Prelacy *from the* Episcopacy *of* Timothy *and* Titus, *is Examined. From* P. 74 *to* P. 84.

UPON this Argument I shall I. Examine His *Reasonings* by which He introduces Himself to it. II. The *Argument* it self, and what He has advanced for makeing it a Good one.

I. I am to Examine His *Reasonings* by which He introduces Himself to the *Argument.* I have so good an Opinion of His Judgment as to believe He Himself was convinced of the Weakness of what He has hitherto advanced. *But,* saith He p. 74, *there is yet still something behind which* ALONE *does* SUFFICIENTLY *prove, that that Superiority of Power which the Apostles exercised over the Subordinate Orders of Clergy Men, that is, over Priests and Deacons* (and why not over Prelats too, seeing there were then such? Wou'd He have us to believe They were *hail Fellow* with the Apostles?) *was not peculiar to Them, and consequently not* EXTRAORDINARY. Now pray what may this be? 'Tis this, 'That the same was communicated to others, even to 'so many, that perhaps there was not a Church constituted by the 'Apostles, where there was not such a Superior Officer appointed; at least this holds True of the greatest Number of these where-'of there is Mention made in the New Testament. It will be very strange if Mr. *Rhind* can make good this: For *First,* There is the Church of *Corinth,* the Churches of *Galatia,* the Churches of *Philippi* and all *Macedonia,* the Church of *Thessalonica,* with a great many more mentioned in the New Testament; but of any such *Superior Officer* in any of 'em there is a deep Silence in the Scripture. *Secondly,* 'Tis the very reverse of Mr. *Doawell's* Doctrine; accord-

according to whom, as we have already heard, there was no such Superior ORDINARY Officer appointed in any Church constituted by the Apostles, the WHOLE Government being managed by EXTRAORDINARY Officers sent from *Jerusalem.* But Mr. *Rhind challenges the* Presbyterians *to condescend from the* Acts *and* Epistles, *upon one Act of* Ordination *and* Jurisdiction, *about which such an Officer was not principally employed.* And I challenge Him again, indeed all His Party, to condescend upon one Act about which such an Officer, not EXTRAORDINARY, was employed. Mr. *Rhind* foresaw that His Challenge would be thus returned And this brings Me

II. To Examine His *Argument* or *Instance* in Answer to the said returned Challenge. *This*, saith He p. 74, *was the Case of* Ephesus *and* Crete, *where* Timothy *and* Titus *acted with such a Superiority of Power.* I Answer, not Good: For *Timothy* and *Titus* were *Extraordinary* Officers, and therefore it cannot be thence inferred That that Superiority of Power was design'd to be perpetual. Mr. *Rhind* was aware that this *Answer* would be made to Him; and therefore having, with unusual Ceremony and Good-breeding, declared p. 76, *that it is not so contemptible as some would represent it*, He applys Himself with all His might to defend against it; and to prove that *Timothy* and *Titus* were not *Extraordinary* Officers, but the *Ordinary* and *fixed* Prelats of *Ephesus* and *Crete.*

This He argues *First*, from the Silence of the Scripture, that there is no Intimation made in all the Acts and Epistles that They were such Extraordinary Officers. *Secondly*, From the Postscripts to their Epistles which expresly call them the *first Bishops*, that is, *Ordinary* and *fixed* Prelates of *Ephesus* and *Crete.* *Thirdly*, From the concurring Testimony of the Ancients, who with one Voice declare as the Postscripts do. *Fourthly*, From Scripture Authorities proving that *Timothy* and *Titus* were of an Order Superior to Presbyters and Deacons, and such as was always to be continued in the Church. A Set of very strong Arguments I acknowledge. Let us Examine whether he has made them good.

First, He asserts *that there is no Intimation made in all the* Acts *and* Epistles *that* Timothy *and* Titus *were such Extraordinary Officers*, p. 77. I affirm the contrary. No, Mr. *Dodwell*, I should have said,

ſaid, affirms the contrary; and Proves, from the very ſame Arguments drawn out of the Epiſtles which the *Presbyterians* have always inſiſted on, that their Office was not fixed with reſpect to *Epheſus* and *Crete*, but that They were Itinerant Miſſionaries. This he proves with Reſpect to *Timothy* from S. *Paul*'s BESEECHING him to abide at *Epheſus*, from his being called an *Evangeliſt*, from his frequent Journeys with S. *Paul*, and the like. And with Reſpect to *Titus*, he affirms *that he was not more confined to any one place than the Apoſtle* Paul *himſelf was*. I have ſet down his Words on the Margin (*x*) that the Reader may ſee all this.

Secondly, he argues from the *Poſtſcripts* to the *Epiſtles* to *Timothy* and *Titus*, *which*, ſaith he p. 78. *do* expreſly *call them the* firſt Biſhops, *that is*, Ordinary *and* fixed *Prelates*, *of* Epheſus *and* Crete. Well, is it true that they were ſo? We have already heard M. *Dodwell*; let us hear another, who was as much concerned to keep the Epiſcopal Cauſe Right as ever Mr. *Rhind* is likely to be. The Perſon I mean is Dr. *Whitby*. 'First, *ſaith he* (*y*), I aſſert, that if by ſaying *Timothy* and *Titus* were Biſhops, the one of *Epheſus* the other of *Crete*, we 'underſtand that they took upon them theſe Churches or Dioceſſes 'as their FIXED and PECULIAR Charge, in which they 'were to preſide for Term of Life, I believe that *Timothy* and *Titus* 'were not thus Biſhops. Thus he. But what now ſhall become of the Credit of the poor *Poſtſcripts* by this? Why the ſame Dr. *Whitby* proves them to be falſe from the very letter of the Text it ſelf in the *Epiſtles*. But Mr. *Rhind* is more tender hearted. 'Though, *ſaith he*, 'They are no Part of the Canon of the Scriptures; yet are they of 'ſo much Authority, that the *Presbyterians* themſelves have not yet 'dar'd to cancel them in the Common Bibles. Very pleaſantly! But then let me ask, in the *Firſt* Place, ſeeing *They are no Part of the Canon*, what Authority can they have beyond what the Reputation

O of

[x] Paræneſ. Sect. 10. p. 40. 41. Sed vero munus illius (*Timothei*) non FIXUM fuiſſe ſed Itinerarium multa arguunt. Rogatum illum manſiſſe *Epheſi* teſtatur Apoſtolus, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. Erat ergo, cum Rogaretur, Itinerarius. Arguit opus *Evangeliſtæ* 2 *Tim.* 4. 5. Arguunt tot illius cum S. *Paulo* itinera, & commune illius cum Apoſtolo Nomen in Inſcriptionibus Epiſtolarum ad *Theſſalonicenſes*. Similiter *Tito*, & quidem ſoli de conſtituendis in *Creta* κατὰ πόλιν Presbyteris, idem præcipit Apoſtolus, *Tit* 1. 5. Relictum illum fuiſſe ait, ut ea quæ deerant, corrigeret. Comitem utique Apoſtoli cum relinqueretur. Et ſane Comitem S. *Pauli* alia quoque loca docent, non magis utique certo alicui loco adſtrictum quam ipſe fuerit Apoſtolus. [y] Preface to the Epiſtle to *Titus*.

of the Authors of them can give them? Now who were the Authors of them? I doubt if that can be discovered unless one would go to *Endor*. Were they at least early? No, I will yield the Argument to Mr. *Rhind* if he can find them for at least 500 Years after the Epistles were written; nay, saies Dr. *Hammond* (z) *We know that the* Subscriptions *of the* Epistles *are not to be found in* all *the Ancient Copies.* 2dly, 'Tis true the *Presbyterians* have not *dar'd* to cancell them in the Common Bibles. But then I would ask him Who first put them into the Common Bibles? I doubt very much if they came there by fair Play. The Oldest *English* Translations have them not. I have by me Rychарde Taverner's Translation Prynted in the yere of oure Lorde God M. D. XXXIX. wherein there is not one Syllable of the Bishopricks of *Timothy* and *Titus*. For Instance, the *Postscript* to the Second Epistle to *Timothy*, bears this only, Written from Rome when Paule was presented the second Tyme up before Emperour Nero. But not one Word of *Timothy*'s being ordained either *First* or *Second* Bishop. I ask Mr. *Rhind*, *Secondly*, who caused print these *Postscripts* in the same *Letter* with the Text, whereas usually they were put in a different *Letter* that they might be known to be no Part of the Canon? Good Mr. *Rhind*, pray purge your Party. In the mean Time it is not very generous to take Advantage of the *Presbyterians* for their not cancelling them, when they *dar'd* not do it; the Power of printing Bibles being the Prince's Gift not the Church's. However from the whole 'tis plain, that it is Ridiculous to make an Argument of these *Postscripts*.

Thirdly, He argues from *the concurring Testimonies of the* Ancients *who with one Voice declare as the* Postscripts *do*. *And to this*, saith he p. 78, *the* Presbyterians *will find themselves straitned to rejoin*. No Doubt. Well, where are these Testimonies of the Ancients? Oh, 'how easie were it for *Him* to add to the Number of Pages by 'Quotations to this Purpose? But still I ask where are they? Nay not one of these Ancients has he quoted to this Purpose, Nay, nor so much as Named. Who now can doubt but the *Presbyterians* must *find themselves straitned to rejoin*? But if an *Episcopalian* rejoin, will

[z] Preface to the 2 Ep. to *Timothy*.

will it not do as well? Hear then Dr. *Whitby*. 'The great Controverſie, *ſaith He* (*a*), concerning this and the Epiſtle to *Timothy*, is, whether *Timothy* and *Titus* were indeed made Biſhops, 'the one of *Epheſus* and the *Proconſular Aſia*, the other of *Crete*, having Authority to make, and *Juriſdiction over ſo many Biſhops as were in thoſe Precincts*. Now of this Matter, I confeſs I can find 'Nothing in *any* Writer of the *firſt three* Centuries, nor any Intimation that they bore that Name. Thus he. And the *Presbyterians* being ſecured from the *Ancients* of the *firſt three* Centuries, any Hazard from the reſt is not much to be regarded: For, as *M. Le Clerc* moſt Judiciouſly obſerves (*b*) 'The Teſtimonies of the 'Antients about this Matter, who Judged raſhly of the Times of the 'Apoſtles by their own, and ſpake of them in the Language of their 'own Age, *are of little Moment*; and ſo do no more prove that *Titus* was Biſhop of the Iſland of *Crete*, than what Dr. *Hammond* 'ſaies, proves Him to have been dignified with the Title of an '*Archbiſhop*.

Fourthly, He argues from Scripture *Authorities which prove*, as he ſaies p. 79, *that* Timothy *and* Titus *were of an Order Superior to Presbyters and Deacons, and ſuch as was always to be continued in the Church*.

Firſt. With reſpect to *Timothy* he obſerves from *Acts* 20. 31. compared with *Acts* 19. 10. and *Acts* 19. 26. and *Acts* 20. 17. that *Epheſus* was furniſhed with Paſtors e're the Apoſtle *Paul* left them. And yet he *beſought* Timothy *to abide there to charge ſome that They ſhould teach no other Doctrine*, and to perform ſeveral other Functions which import a Superiority of Power, with reſpect to *Ordination* and *Juriſdiction*: 'For, *ſaith He* p. 81, Is it to be ſuppoſed, if the 'Presbyters and Deacons of *Epheſus* could alone have diſcharged 'theſe Offices, that St. *Paul* wou'd have continued *Timothy* there, 'encroaching on their Divine Right. The Anſwer is abundantly obvious; for *Firſt*, when the Apoſtle was a departing out of theſe Bounds, he warned the Elders of *Epheſus* that *after His Departure Grievous Wolves ſhould enter in not ſparing the Flock*. To give a

[*a*] Ibid. ubi Supra p. 485. Vol. II. [*b*] Supplement to Dr. *Hammond's* Annot. on the Ep. to *Titus*. (mihi) 530.

Check to such it was Expedient in the Infancy of that Church, (none of Her Ministers being then above three Years Standing in the Office *Acts* 20. 31.) that a Person both of Extraordinary Character and Gifts should be among them. Which, when once the Government was settled and Things brought into a fixed Order, there would be no such Occasion for. *Secondly*, *Paul*'s beseeching *Timothy to abide at* Ephesus is a certain Argument, as we have heard from Mr. *Dodwell*, That he was not there established Bishop: For to what End should He *beseech* a Bishop to reside in his own Dioceſs, when he could not do otherwise without offending God and neglecting his Duty. *Thirdly*, The Elders of *Ephesus* already ordain'd were Bishops. So, saies Dr. *Hammond*, nay so saies the Sacred Text *Acts* 20. 28. *over which the Holy Ghost hath made you* Bishops: And therefore as *Bishops* They had Power to perform all Ministerial Functions, and only wanted such an Extraordinary Person as *Timothy* to direct and assist them in their present Circumstances. The *Romans*, sometimes when the Common Wealth was in Imminent Danger, created a Dictator with an Absolute Power for Six Months, without bounding him with any other Instructions but that he should take care *Ne quid Detrimenti Respublica caperet*. But will it therefore follow that the *Dictatorship* was a standing Office? Or will the *Roman*'s making Choise of such an Officer in their Extremity justifie or excuse *Sylla* or *Julius Cæsar* who would needs have themselves declared *Perpetual Dictators*, and thereby enslaved their Native Country. Though one takes Physick when he is sick, yet it would be a very unpleasant Diet for Ordinary. Though a Gentleman wears leading Strings while he is a Child; and is under Tutors or Curators till he is *one* and *Twenty*, does it follow that he must always be so?

Secondly, With respect to *Titus* Mr. *Rhind* suggests that he was left at *Crete* with a Power to inspect the Qualifications of such as should be ordained *Chap.* 1. 7. to *rebuke* Elders as well as others *Chap.* 2. 15. to *reject*, that is to Excommunicate, *Hereticks*, and all this notwithstanding there were other Church Officers ordained there before: For *He was left to set in Order the Things* (relating to *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction*) *which were wanting* which must needs inferr that he acted in a Capacity Superior to them. 'Tis answered.

ed. *Crete* was as yet in a great Measure unplanted when *Paul* left him there. He was left there on Purpose *to Ordain Elders in every City*. These Elders whom he ordain'd were *Bishops*; the Text expressly saies it *Chap.* 1. 5----7. Dr. *Hammond* Himself owns it. When therefore they were once ordain'd, they had Power to perform all Acts any Bishop is capable of. But Mr. *Rhind* asserts p. 83, 'That '*Titus*, after he had ordained Elders in every one of the Cities of '*Crete*, *continued* there exercising what we properly call an Epis-'copal Jurisdiction over them when ordained. But, *First*, not one Word has he offered for the Proof of this. *Secondly*, The Scripture contradicts it as we shall hear just now. *Thirdly*, If he exercised any Jurisdiction over them, they being Bishops themselves, it could not be simply an *Episcopal* but strictly and properly an *Archiepiscopal* Jurisdiction. But 'tis plain he did not continue in *Crete* to exercise either: For, *Fourthly*, Dr. *Whiby* not only confesses, but proves from Scripture that he did *not* continue there. 'As for '*Titus* he was only left at *Crete* to *Ordain Elders in every City and to* '*set in Order the Things that were wanting*. Having therefore done 'that Work, he had done all that was assigned him in that Sta-'tion. And therefore S. *Paul* sends for him the very next Year to '*Nicopolis Tit.* 3. 12. Thus He. If therefore Mr. *Rhind*'s Instance prove any Thing, it must be the Divine Right of *Non-residence*, which indeed wou'd be no ungratefull Performance to several People in the World.

Thus I have gone through whatever Mr. *Rhind* has advanced on this Proof. And now to Conclude it; there is Nothing Surer than that there was a perfect Equality among *Bishops* for the first three Centuries, and so M. *Dodwell* affirms. There is Nothing plainer from the Scripture than that there were Bishops at *Ephesus* before *Timothy* was left there; and that those whom *Titus* ordained in *Crete* were *Bishops* in all that Sence of the Word the New Testament owns. How then *Timothy* and *Titus* cou'd be the *fixed* and *ordinary* Prelats of *Ephesus* and *Crete* is beyond the Power of Natural Understanding to conceive. If Mr. *Rhind* can solve me in this one Scruple, or if any other of his Brethren can, I shall own it as a singular Obligation. And therefore I desire them to take pains on their Answer, and to Labour it with all due Care.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE IV.

Wherein Mr. Rhind *s Proof for* Prelacy *from the* Apocalyptick Angels, *is Examined. From* P. 84 *to* P. 86.

MR. *Rhind* is much ſhorter on this than on any of the Preceeding Proofs. The Reaſon, no doubt, is, becauſe 'tis much clearer. And therefore He puts on all his Airs, and treats the *Presbyterians* with a Noble Diſdain in the Confidence of it; wondring They can be ſo *Senſleſs* or Obſtinate as to reſiſt its Evidence. That I may not wrong Him, I ſhall ſet down every Word of what he has on it without the leaſt Omiſſion.

'And that ſuch a Superior Order did obtain a conſiderable Time 'after this, is evident from the Inſtances of the *Seven* Apocalyp-'tick Angels, to whom our Lord directs ſo many Epiſtles 'by his Servant St. *John*: A plain Indication of his Appro-'bation of that Authority which they exerciſed; eſpecially con-'ſidering that there is no Inſinuation made to its Diſadvantage in 'the Epiſtles directed to them. And that theſe Angels were *ſingle* 'Perſons, and the *Governors* of theſe Churches, will be *evident* 'to any who ſhall impartially conſider the 2d and 3d Chap. of the '*Revelation*, where they are *plainly characterized* as ſuch, *ſo very* '*plainly, that perhaps all the Authors who ever commented upon them,* '*whether Ancient or Modern, have ſuppoſed them to be ſuch.* Nor was 'it *ever queſtioned by any*, till the Intereſt of a Party obliged ſome 'to ſearch for Criticiſms, by which they might ſeem with their 'Followers to anſwer the Argument drawn from theſe Inſtances 'for *Epiſcopacy*: But the Evaſions they have been forced to uſe, 'are ſo *ſenſeleſs*, and have been ſo often expoſed as ſuch, that I am 'ſaved the Labour of expoſing them further, or of repeating what has

"has been already said to disprove them; only I must add, that "so groundless are they, and such is the Evidence of Truth on the "*Episcopal* Side, that it extorted from some *Presbyterian* Authors and "particularly from *Beza*, one of the most Zealous and Learned Pa"trons of Parity, a Confession that these Angels were *single* Per"sons, and the *Governors* of these seven *Asian* Churches.

Now let us examine all this.

In the First Place. Were these *Apocalyptick* Angels the *fixed* Bishops of these Churches? 'Tis true Mr. *Dodwell*, in his Book of the *One Priesthood and one Altar* which he published in the Year 1683, is of the Opinion (*c*) *that the Bishops are here represented in a Mystical Way, and personated by the Name of* Angels; but in his *Paræneſis*, a Book which he published above 20 Years after the former, and which consequently must be supposed to be the Wiser Book of the two, he frequently inculcates, as we have heard before, that there were no *fixed* Bishops in the World at that Time; and particularly as to these Apocalyptick Angels, though he is in a very great Doubt what to make of them (*d*), yet by no means will he allow them either to have been *Bishops* or indeed the *fixed Presbytries* of the Place; but guesses them to have been Itinerary Legates sent from *Jerusalem* answering to the *seven Spirits* Zach. 4. 10. *that are the Eyes of the Lord which run to and fro through the whole Earth.* (*e*) Was Mr. *Rhind* then to seek for Confidence when he would be so positive in a Matter of which the greatest Man of his Party cou'd not have a clear View; and in which, so far as he could guess, he has determined against Him.

Secondly, How came Mr. *Rhind* to *number* these Apocalyptick Angels, calling them the *SEVEN* Apocalyptick Angels? The *Apocalypse* it self does not call them SEVEN. It is said indeed *Chap.* 1. 20. that *the seven Candlesticks are the seven Churches*, there both the Symbols and Things represented by them are

[c] Chap. XII. Sect. 2. p. 332. &c. [d] Vide Sect. 10. p. 32.

[e] Paræneſ. Sect. 10. p. 32. Ita fuisse necesse erat, si quidem vere Episcopi fuissent Angeli Apocalyptici. Sed de illis sententiam nostram intra explicabimus. p. 39. 40. Si non suffecerint, sic alios fuisse verisimillimum esset Angelos Ecclesiarum Apocalypticos ab institutis locorum Presbyteris. Erant ergo etiam ipsi fortasse Hierosolymitanorum Legati, sed Apostolis ipsis obnoxii.---ut proinde *Oculis Domini septenis Spiritibus* respondeant *Angeli Apocalyptici* qui discurrebant per universam Terram.---Sic fuerint etiam Hi Ecclesiarum Præsules non e loco oriundi, sed missi *Hierosolymis* Itinerarii.

are numbered: But it is not so in the other Branch. 'Tis not said *The Seven Stars are the* Seven *Angels*, *but* indefinitly *are the Seven Angels of the seven Churches.* Is not this a plain Indication that the Holy Ghost would not oblige us to take the Word *Angels* singularly?

Thirdly, are these Angels *characterized* as single Persons? Though Mr. *Rhind* indeed is more than ordinarly Sharp sighted, yet I am so far from seeing this *Evident*, that I cannot discern one Shadow of it; but on the contrary, I think I see them, and that too as *plainly* as ever I saw any Thing, *characterized* so as to denote a Collective Body. Possibly my Sight is vitiated; but then much greater Men I'm sure than I, and at least as good Friends to the *Episcopal* Cause, have seen them just the same Way. Dr. *Henry More*, a Man of an Apocalyptick Genius himself, frankly owns (*f*) 'That by *Angels*, ac-'cording to the Apocalyptick Stile, all the Agents under their Pre-'sidency are represented or insinuate. And this, *saith he*, is so fre-'quent and obvious in the *Apocalypse*, that none that is versed there-'in can any wise doubt of it. Wherefore Christ his Writing to the 'Angel of the Church of *Ephesus* in this Mystical Sense is his Writ-'ting to all Bishops, Pastors and Christians in the first Apostolical In-'terval of the Church. Thus Dr. *More*. Yea Mr. *Dodwell* himself owns (*g*) That the whole Churches of the *Lydian* or *Proconsular Asia* are to be understood by the Mystical Representation in the *Apocalypse*, and that the Reason why S. *John* confined his Number to *Seven* is, 'not that by any Geographical Distinction those Seven Cities 'were incorporated into a Body more than others of that Province, 'but that he had a particular Regard to the Number of the Angels 'of the Presence. How is all this consistent with their being *characterized* as *single* Persons? But let us wave Human Judgment and appeal to the Text.

Fourthly. I ask, Are these Angels *characterized* in the 2d and 3d *Chap.* of the *Revelation* as *single* Persons and the *Governors* of these Churches? 'Tis true each Epistle is directed *to the Angel* in the singular Number. But 'tis as true, that that Title agrees to every Minister of the Gospel, and to every one that bears the Message of

(*f*) Expos of the seven Ep. to the Seven Churches p. 29 [g] One Priesthood Chap. XII. Sect. 2.

of the Lord. And it is as true, that the Word *Angel* even in the *singular* Number bears a *Collective* Sense; as when it is said Psalm 34. 7. *The Angel of the Lord encamps round about them that fear him.* So that nothing can be inferred on the *Episcopal* Side either from the Title it self, or from the Usage of it in the singular Number. But then if we look into the Body of the Epistles themselves, consider the Way how they are ushered in, and the solemn Clause with which each of them concludes, 'tis plain that *Angel* must be taken in a Collective Sense, as including not only all the Ministers of the Church but indeed the whole Church it self. Thus, in the *first* Place *John* directs his Revelations *to the* Seven Churches *which are in Asia. Rev.* 1. 4. Thus *the Voice behind him* ordered him, *What thou seest write in a Book, and send it unto the seven Churches which are in Asia Rev.* 1. v. 10. 11. Thus at the End of the whole Vision, *I Jesus have sent mine Angel to testify unto you these Things in the* Churches *Rev.* 22. 16. Thus at the End of every of the Epistles there is that Solemn Clause, *he that hath an Ear to hear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the* Churches. *Secondly,* if we look into the Bodies of the Epistles themselves, we shall find the Thing still more clear. *First* in the Epistle to the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus* shall we think that the Commendation for *Labour* and *Patience*, the Reproof of the *Decay* of the *first Love*, the Exhortation to *Repentance*, the Threatning to *remove the Candlestick out of his Place*, were directed to or concern'd only one *single* Person? Would our Saviour punish a whole Church so grievously as to deprive them of the Gospel for the Fault of their Bishop? No. *When he saies the Angel of* Ephesus, *He means the Church in it* saith *Aretas* Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia* (*h*). 2ly, When he bids the Angel of the Church of *Smyrna. Fear none of these things which thou shalt suffer*: Is it not presently added, *Behold the Devil shall cast* SOME *of* YOU *into Prison that* YE *may be tryed*; *and* YE *shall have Tribulation ten Days.* Is this the *Characterizing* of a *single* Person? When he exhorts to *Faithfulness*, and makes Promise *to him that overcomes*, does he direct to the Bishop only? No, saith *Augustin* (*i*) *He saies it to the whole Church.* 3dly, When he saith to the Angel of the Church of *Pergamus, I know thy Works, and where thou*

 dwellest,

[h] Comment. in Apoc. τὴν ἐν αὐτῇ ἐκκλησίαν λέγει.
[i] *Augustin* Tom. IX. *Homil.* 2. in *Apoc.* Omni Ecclesiæ dicit.

dwelleſt, even where Satan's Seat is, was it the Biſhop only had ſuch bad Quarters, when 'tis inſtantly added in the end of the Verſe, *Antipas my faithfull Martyr was ſlain among* YOU *where Satan dwelleth?* No, ſaith *Auguſtin* (*k*), 'theſe things under a *ſingular* Word are ſaid 'to the *whole* Church, becauſe *Satan* dwells every where by His 'Body: Now the Body of Satan are Proud and wicked Men, 'juſt as the Body of Chriſt are ſuch as are humble and Good. Indeed the whole Church in theſe Parts was in the greateſt Danger of Idolatry, or of Perſecution in Caſe of not complying with it: For in *Pergamus* ſtood the famous Temple of *Æſculapius*, whither the greateſt Perſonages went, or ſent their Gifts becauſe of the Fame of his Oracle. Thither *Earinus Domitian's freed* Man ſent his conſecrated Hair with a Mirrour and a Box ſet with Jewels (*l*). Thither the Emperour *Antonius Caracalla* went to be cured of his Sickneſs by the God, and to ly in for Dreams (*m*). Thither alſo *Apollonius Tyanæus*, who was ſet up to mate our Saviour, went to be Director of the Oracle, and to inſtruct the Votaries that came there how They might obtain Divine Dreams from the God (*n*). To this God Dragons and Serpents were Sacred, and maintained on the Publick Charge in His Temple. Fittly therefore was Satan that *Dragon* and *old Serpent* Rev. 12. 9. ſaid to have *His Seat* there. Add to all this, that admitting there had been ſuch Officers as *Prelates* in thoſe Days, yet it would be probable that the *See* was Vacant at this Time: For, as the Tradition goes, *Antipas* was the Biſhop of that Place; but *He* was Martyred in the Tenth Year of *Domitian*, as the *Roman* Martyrology bears; which was the very Year in which, as the moſt common Tradition carries it, *John* the *Divine* was baniſhed to *Patmos*. And Dr. *Hammond*, forſeeing, it ſeems, this Difficulty, placed *John's* Baniſhment in the Reign of *Claudius*. And makes the Relation of the Martyrdom of *Antipas* Rev. 2. 13. to be not *Hiſtory* but *Propheſie*; and whereas

---

[k] *Ubi ſupra* -- omni Eccleſiæ dicit in unius vocabulo, quia ubique habitat Satanas per Corpus ſuum. Corpus autem Satanæ homines ſunt ſuperbi & mali: Sicut & corpus Chriſti humiles & boni.

[l] ------ Dulceſque Capillos
Pergameo poſuit dona ſacrata Deo. *Mart.*

[m] *Herodian* Lib. 4. Cap. 5. 11.

(n) *Philoſtr.* in vit. *Apoll.* Lib. 4. Cap. III.

whereas the Text reads, *Antipas my Faithfull Martyr* was *slain*, He paraphraſes it, *Antipas, for His Fidelity and Courage in preaching the Goſpel*, will be (I foreſee) *cruelly Martyr'd*. And if the *See* was Vacant at that Time, how could the Epiſtle be directed to the Biſhop? 4thly, When He writes to the Angel of the Church in *Thyatira*, was it the Works, Charity, Service, Faith and Patience of the Biſhop alone that He commends *verſe* 19? Was it the Biſhop alone whom He reproved for *ſuffering that Woman* Jezabel? No, ſaith, *Auguſtin* (*o*). 'It was ſuch (*in the Plural Number*) 'as were ſet over the Church, who neglected to impoſe that Se- 'vere Diſcipline upon Fornicators and other riotous Livers which 'They ought. Is the Angel of that Church characterized as a *ſingle* Perſon, when 'tis expreſly ſaid *verſe* 24. *But unto* YOU *I ſay, and unto the reſt in* Thyatira. Are not here two Parts of the Church plainly diſtinguiſhed, viz. the Miniſters thereof in the *plural* Word YOU, and the people deſcribed by *the reſt in* Thyatira? The only Anſwer which the *Epiſcopal* Party have for avoiding the Force of this Obſerve is, That the Word *and* is not to be found in ſome Copies; and ſo they read the Text thus, *Unto you I ſay the reſt in* Thyatira. But all Anſwers are to be ſuſpected that invade the Text. 'Tis true, the Word *and* is wanting in *ſome* Copies; but it is as true it is to be found in *many* moe, and theſe too of as good Credit and as great Antiquity. In the Year 1546 *Tonſtall* Biſhop of *Durham* found *an Expoſition on the Apocalypſe* bearing the Name of St. *Ambroſe* the Biſhop (*p*), which He publiſhed in the Year 1554, and in His preface to the Reader He is earneſt to have him believe that it is the Work of *Ambroſe* Biſhop of *Milan*, and *He* expreſly reads it with the *And*. I believe indeed *Tonſtall* was deceived about the Author. But this is certain that whoever He was, He was a very Ancient Writer, and according-

[o] Quod autem dicit Angelo Thyatiræ Eccleſiæ [*Habeo adverſum te pauca*] dicit Præpoſitis Eccleſiarum? qui Luxurioſis & fornicantibus, & aliud quod libet malum agentibus ſeveritatem Diſciplinæ Eccleſiaſticæ non imponunt. *Hom.* 2. in Apoc.

(p) Expoſitio Beati Ambroſii Epiſcopi ſuper Apocalypſin.

ly the Work is inſerted among thoſe of St. *Ambroſe* (*q*). And though that Writer ſometimes mentions the *Biſhop* in His Expoſition of theſe ſeven Epiſtles, yet he not only interprets the *Stars* by *Holy Preachers* in the general, but alſo lays down (*r*) this as a general Rule, That *all* the Governours of the *Catholick* Church are ſignified by theſe Angels, and that becauſe of their being Meſſengers of the Word of God, to the People, ſeeing the Word *Angel* ſignifies a *Meſſenger*. And though *Beza* upon the Authority of the *old interpreter* and of the *Compiutenſian* Edition and two other Copies did read the ſaid 24 *verſe* without the *AND*, yet in other Editions (*s*) He has inſerted it, and always expounds the Phraſe *To the Angel*, by theſe words *To the Paſtors*. 5thly, When he gives this Character of the Angel of the Church of *Sardis*, *Thou haſt a Name that thou liveſt, and art Dead*, Is it a Deſcription of one *ſingle* Perſon in that Church whether Biſhop or Presbyter? Is it not rather of that whole Church excepting theſe *few Names* mentioned *verſe* 4. *Chap.* 3. *which* had *not defiled their Garments*? Yes certainly, and ſo the forecited *Auguſtin* ſaies, and gives it for a general Rule, much after the ſame Way with *Ambroſe* before cited, 'That becauſe *Angel* ſignifies a *Meſſenger*, therefore whoever either 'Biſhop or Presbyter or even Lay-Man ſpeaks frequently of God 'and tells Men how They may come to eternal Life, is deſervedly called the Angel of God (*t*). 6thly, When he ſaies to the Angel of the Church in *Philadelphia*, *I have ſet before Thee an open Door*,---- *Thou haſt a little Strength, and haſt kept my Word* &c. Did He mean thereby to characterize a *ſingle* Perſon? No, 'tis plain it is the Character of the Church, and ſo the forecited *Auguſtin* expreſly ſaies (*u*). Indeed there is not one Clauſe in the whole Epiſtle that ſo much as *ſeems* to deſcribe a *ſingle* Perſon, yea even that

[q] Edit. Coloniæ Agrippinæ. 1661. [r] Sancti Prædicatores.--- Cap. 1. ad finem. Septem igitur Angelos, Rectores ſeptem Eccleſiarum debemus intelligere, eo quod Angelus NUNTIUS interpretatur. Et qui Verbum Dei populis annunciant, non inconvenienter ANGELI, id eſt, NUNTII vocantur. Et ſicut per ſeptem Eccleſias, una Eccleſia Catholica, ita per ſeptem Rectores ſeptem Eccleſiarum omnes Rectores Eccleſiæ Catholicæ deſignantur. [s] Edit. folio Londini. Anno 1592.

[t] Nam quia etiam Angelus Nuncius interpretatur, quicunque aut Epiſcopus aut Presbyter aut etiam Laicus frequenter de Deo loquitur, & quomodo ad vitam æternam perveniatur annunciat, merito Angelus Dei Dicitur. *Hom.* 2. in Apoc.

[u] Hoc ideo dictum eſt, ut nullus dicat, quia oſtium quod Deus aperit *Eccleſiæ*, in toto mundo aliquis poſſit vel in parte claudere. Hom. 3. Ibid.

that Promise *verse* 9. *Behold I will make them of the Synagogue of Satan to come and Worship before thy Feet*, imports Nothing of peculiar Priviledge to the Bishop, but meerly signifies the Effect that the Preaching of the Gospel should have upon these Enemies, as the forecited *Ambrose* explains it (*x*). Lastly, the like is to be said of the Church of *Laodicea* in the whole Epistle to the Angel thereof there is not one Clause that Characterizes a *single* Person. I add further, that in *none* of these *seven* Epistles is there *one* Act of *Episcopal* Jurisdiction so much as *hinted* at; not *any* Act which is not competent to *all* the Ministers of the Gospel, yea indeed to the *People* themselves; for Instance, when it is said of the Church of *Ephesus Chap.* 2 *ver.* 2. 'Thou hast tryed them which say they 'are Apostles, and are not, and hast found them Liars; it is no more than what is the Duty, and will be the Practice of every good Christian, all being enjoined 1 *John* 4. 1. 'Beloved, believe 'not every Spirit, but try the Spirits, whether they are of God 'because many false Prophets are gone out into the World. Again, when the Church of *Thyatira* is blamed for *suffering that Woman* Jezabel, every Christian may be guilty of the like, being discharged to own or countenance Infamous and Obstinate Hereticks. 2 *John* 10. 'If there come any unto you and bring not this Do-'ctrine, receive Him not into your House, neither bid him God Speed. Besides, several Authors relate, and Dr. *Fulk* against the *Rhemists* upon the Place takes notice of it, that the said *Jezabel* was the Bishop's Wife; though I do not believe this, because I am very sure that there was no such thing as a *Bishop* in the Modern Sense at that Time, yet, upon that Supposition, His Fault would have been rather a Neglect of his Martial Authority than of his Episcopal Power; consequently it cannot be inferred thence that he is described there as a *Governour* of the Church. Upon the whole then, Mr. *Rhind* has been too unwary, and His *Forwardness* has mightily outrun his *Judgment* when he asserted, That these Angels are *characterized* in the 2d and 3d Chapters of the Revelation as *single* Persons Dr. *Hammond* Himself, though so earnest

[x] Id est, cum crediderint per verba tua in me, adorabunt ante Pedes tuos, deprecantes, ut per te Vitam æternam consequantur. *Ambros.* ubi supra, 2.

to have these Angels believed to be *single* Persons, yet he had not Courage enough to affirm, that They are *characterized* there as such, nay indeed he confesses the contrary (*y*). 'Though the 'Angels, *saith He*, were single Persons, *yet what is said to them is* 'not said only to their Persons, *but to the Universality of the People* 'under them, whose Non-Proficiency, or Remission of Degrees of 'Christian Virtue, especially their falling off from the Constancy 'and Courage of their Profession, do deserve (and are accordingly threatned with) the Removal of that Christian Knowledge, 'that Grace, those Priviledges of a Church which had been allowed them, C. 2. 5. *which is not so properly appliable as a Punishment* 'of the Bishop, *as of the People under him.* And therefore in the '*Paraphrase* I have generally changed the singular into the plural 'number, by that means to leave it *indifferently to the Bishop of each* 'Church *and the People under Him*, and yet further to the *other* 'Churches subordinate to each of the *Metropoles* here named. Thus Dr. *Hammond*. And elsewhere (*z*) He is forced to acknowledge, That 'those Expressions, which are used in the singular Num-'ber, do not all belong to the Bishop, but to the Church where-'in he presides. The very Truth is Dr. *Hammond* has absolutly destroyed this Argument of the Apocalyptick Angels. For First, He has made them not simply *Bishops*, but *Metropolitans*, a Notion wherein his whole Party, I believe, have now deserted him; yet he very Judiciously saw that the Argument could not be so much as coloured without some such Notion. 2dly, He elsewhere (*a*) makes a twofold Bishop in the same Place; of which the one was set over the *Jewish* and the other over the *Gentile* Christians. How then could these Angels be *single* Persons? Were the Epistles written only to the circumcised, or only to the uncircumcised? But to go on with Mr. *Rhind*.

Fifthly, Is it true *that all the Authors Ancient and Modern who have commented upon the* 2*d and* 3*d* Chap. *of the* Revelation *have supposed these* Angels *to be* single *Persons and the Governors of these Churches*? I suppose this Question may be abundantly satisfied from what I have already

[*y*] Annot. in Rev. Chap. 1. v. 20. [*z*] Vind. of the Differt. Chap. I. Sect. 11.
[*a*] Premonition to the second Epistle of S. John.

already discourſed: For we have heard *Arethas*, *Ambroſe*, *Auguſtin* applying the Seven Epiſtles to the whole Collective Body of the Church. *Arethas* is an unconteſted Author; of *Ambroſe* I have ſpoke before. The only Queſtion is about *Auguſtin* whether theſe *Homilies* on the *Revelation*, which I have cited, are indeed his. But this Queſtion does not affect the Controverſie. For, though *Eraſmus* (*b*) ſuſpects them not to be *Auguſtin*'s, yet it is agreed on all Hands that they are the Work of an *Ancient* Writer, which ſufficiently confutes Mr. *Rhind*. And beſides theſe, if Mr. *Rhind*'s Memory had ſerved him, which one might have expected after his telling that he had ſtudied the Controverſie with a *Scrupulous Exactneſs*, He might have remembred that there are many other Authors both Ancient and Modern inſiſted on by the *Presbyterians* (*c*) viz. *Ambroſius Ansbertus* (whom ſome miſtake for the *Ambroſe* whom I have cited) *Primaſius*, *Gregory* the Great, *Haymo*, *Beda*, *Richard*, *Thomas*, *Fulk*, *Fox* and *Perkins*. But Mr. *Rhind* made choice of the eaſieſt Way of doing his Buſineſs: For who would undergo the Drudgery of examining Things that imagines His Reader is to be put off with bold and blind Aſſertion? We have indeed very few *Ancient* Writers on the Apocalypſe. It was ſome Time before it was Univerſally received as Canonical, and the Commentaries of ſuch as wrote upon it, (ſuch as *Juſtin Martyr* and *Irenæus*) in the firſt *three* Centuries are now loſt; and though ſuch as wrote upon it afterward, when *Prelacy* turned Rampant, had interpreted according to the Epiſcopal Scheme, it cou'd make no Argument againſt the *Presbyterians*: But when the Evidence of Truth, notwithſtanding that Temptation, forced them to interpret, as we have heard them doing; it is an irreparable Loſs to the *Epiſcopal* Cauſe. And for Mr. *Rhind* to alledge at random, that all Authors both *Ancient* and *Modern* are on the *Epiſcopal* Side, without citeing, nay without ſo much as nameing any one of them, except *Beza* alone, of whom juſt now, was to be too Prodigal of the Credit of his Judgment, and is no great Argument of the Diſcretion of His Brethren who Midwif'd His Book into the World.

Laſtly,

[*b*] Præfat. ad Lect. Non videtur *Auguſtini*, quanquam opus lectu dignum. (*c*) Gerſon. Inſtr. p. 202. Alt. Damaſ. Cap. 4. p. 98. 99. Naz. Querel. Par. ad. Sect. 5. Smectymnus, Sect. 13. &c.

Lastly, Has *Beza* said any Thing upon this Argument that favours the *Episcopal* Cause? Mr. *Rhind* brings him in with a great Deal of Parade as if he were clear on the *Episcopal* Side. But why did he not cite his Words? Why does he give us his own Commentary without *Beza*'s Text? Why truly there was Reason for it. *Beza*'s Words are these (*d*). 'To the *Angel*, that is, to the Pre-'sident (or Moderator) whom, to wit, it behoved in the first 'Place to be admonished concerning these Matters, and by him 'the rest of the *Colleagues*, and so the whole Church. But from 'thence to inferr the *Episcopal* Degrees, which was afterwards brought 'into the Church of God by Human Inventions, is *what neither can nor ought to be done*. Nay, not that that Office of President or Moderator 'should necessarly be perpetual, as the Oligarchical Tyranny (whose 'Head is the Antichristian Beast) which arose thence now makes it 'manifest, with the most certain Ruin, not only of the whole Church 'but World also. Judge now, good Reader, of Mr. *Rhind*'s Modesty, and say whether *Beza* is on the *Episcopal* Side. If he cou'd find Testimonies of *Presbyterian* Authors on his Side, I'm sure he is sufficiently qualified to improve them, when he could be so confident on a Testimony that was clearly against him.

So much for the Argument from the *Apocalyptick Angels*, And I hope I may appeal to the Reader if ever he knew *any* more senseless or more groundless used by *any* Party on *any* Cause: For, supposing it were plain even to a Demonstration, that these Angels were *single* Persons, yet where is there the least Intimation that these *single* Persons had the *Sole* Power either of *Ordination* or *Jurisdiction*; or even a *Negative* over the Presbyters in these things? Without this it can be no Argument for the Modern Episcopacy. Yet so true is it that there is no Intimation thereof, that Dr. *Hammond* will not allow that there were any meer *Presbyters* at that Time, wherein he is certainly right. And as that Notion quite destroys the Argument from the *Apocalyptick Angels*, so Dr. *Whitby* has observed (*e*) That the same Notion destroys

(d) *Beza* in *Apocalyp.* 2. 1. Angelo, id est, προεστωτι, quem opportuit nimirum imprimis de his rebus admoneri, ac per eum cæteros Collegas, totamque adeo Ecclesiam. Sed hinc statui Episcopalis ille Gradus, postea humanitus in Ecclesiam Dei invectus, certe nec potest nec debet. Imo ne perpetuum quidem istud προεστωτος munus esse necessario opportuisse, sicut exorta inde Tyrrannis Oligarchica [cujus Apex est Antichristiana bestia] certissima cum totius, non Ecclesiæ modo, sed etiam Orbis Pernicie nunc tandem declarat.

[e] Annot. on 1 Peter 5. 1.

ſtroys two other Arguments already adduced by Mr. *Rhind*, and ordinarily inſiſted on by the *Epiſcopal* Writers viz. That from *the Form of Government which obtain'd among the* Jews; and the other from *the Subordination of the* Seventy *to the* Twelve. 'If *ſaith he*, the Middle 'Order had been wanting ſo long as is ſuppoſed, viz. by Dr. *Ham-* 'mond, the Government of the Church would not have been for- 'med after that (the *Jewiſh*) Plat Form; which, as *Epiphanius* and 'the *Jews* inform us, had theſe ſeveral Offices in it. The ſame may be 'ſaid of thoſe who make the Elders or *Presbyters* to be anſwerable to 'the *Seventy*, appointed by Chriſt as inferiour Officers under the 'Apoſtles, and make this an Argument of an Inequality betwixt 'Biſhops and Presbyters, eſtabliſhed in the Church by Chriſt. Thus Dr. *Whitby*. The *Presbyterians* then are obliged to Dr. *Hammond* for eaſing them of *three* the moſt noiſie Arguments of their Adverſaries.

ARTICLE V.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Proof of* Prelacy *from Teſtimonies of* Antiquity, *is Examined. From* P. 85. *to* P. 111.

HAVING cleared our Hands of the Arguments from the Scripture, we proceed next to conſider the Teſtimonies from *Antiquity*. Mr. *Rhind* is at a great deal of Pains for ſix *Pages* together to perſwade the *Presbyterians* to appeal to the Ancients; and runs through all the common Places of Rhetorick to ſhew how competent and unexceptionable Witneſſes they are. But all this is wretched Affectation: For *Firſt*, the *Epiſcopal* Authors themſelves own that the *Presbyterians* have the Fathers on their ſide. We heard before Dr. *Bedell* juſtifying *Medina* in owning that *Ambroſe*, *Auguſtin*, *Sedulius*, *Primaſius*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Theodoret*,

doret, Oecumenius and *Theophylact* are on the *Presbyterian* Side. This then was only a Stroke of Mr. *Rhind*'s Politicks to gull his Reader into a Belief that the Fathers are against the *Presbyterians*. 2dly, In all Cases the *Presbyterians* are content to be concluded by the Testimony of the Fathers, or to give a good Reason why they cannot. And I know no Class of Christians that goes further, or gives an implicite Assent to their Dictates. The Fathers Themselves required no such Thing of such as were to come after them, and in a Thousand Places have desired their Readers to try before they trusted. And I'm sure there is abundance of Reason for doing so. For there is no Man that has dipped ever so little into the Study of 'em, but is convinced, that any that would swallow their Doctrines by the Lump must at once believe the greatest absurdities and most palpable Contradictions; and none have noticed this with greater Freedom than the Church of *England* Divines. 'The Scripture, *saith* Dr. *Sherlock* (*f*) is all of a Piece, every 'Part of it agrees with the rest; the Fathers many Times contra-'dict themselves and each other: *And He tells, how* it has often 'made him smile, with a Mixture of *Pity* and Indignation to see 'what a great Noise the *Roman* Disputants made among Women 'and Children and the meanest sort of people with Quotations 'out of Fathers and Councils, whom they pretend to be all on 'their Side. I shall be glad if this be not the Character of some other Folks as well as the *Roman* Disputants. To the same Purpose the Incomparable *Chillingworth* (*g*). 'I for my part, *saith* 'He, after a long, and (as I verily believe and hope) impartial 'Search of the true way to Eternal Happiness, do profess plainly, 'that I cannot find any rest for the Sole of my Feet, but upon this 'Rock only, viz. the Scripture. I see plainly and with my own Eyes, 'Councils against Councils, some Fathers against others, the same Fa-'thers against themselves, a Consent of Fathers of one Age against a 'Consent of Fathers of another Age, and the Church of one Age 'against the Church of another Age. Thus He. And thus from two of the greatest Men the Church of *England* cou'd ever boast of

[f] Preservative against *Popery* Part I Chap. 2d Sect. 3d.
[g] Prot. Rel. a Safe way Chap. VI Sect. 56.

of we may learn what habile Witneſſes the Fathers are, and how great Weight will hang upon their Teſtimony: For, if ſuch a Character of the Fathers be both Senſe and Truth in the Mouths of theſe great Men when diſputing againſt the *Romaniſts*, is it poſſible but it muſt be the ſame in the Mouths of *Presbyterians* when diſputing againſt the *Prelatiſts*? But indeed the *Presbyterians* need no ſuch Common-Place Conſiderations for defending themſelves. So far as Mr. *Rhind* has gone I am content the Debate be compromiſed, and referred to the Fathers and the Teſtimony of Antiquity.

He inſiſts on Five viz. *Ignatius*, *Clemens Romanus*, the Emperour *Adrian*, *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*. All which I ſhall conſider in Order.

The Firſt is *Ignatius*, ‘ who, *ſaith He* p. 91,
‘ was conſtituted Biſhop of *Antioch*, upon *IGNATIUS*
‘ the Death of *Evodius*, the immediate Succeſſ-
‘ or of Saint *Peter*, and who in His *Epiſtles* teſtifies moſt favourably
‘ for *Epiſcopacy*. To which it is anſwered. In the *firſt* Place. ’Tis ridiculous to affirm that S. *Peter* was Biſhop of *Antioch*; the Apoſtolick Character and Office being inconſiſtant with the fixed Charge of any particular See. 2dly, Suppoſeing it had not been ſo, yet both *Chryſoſtom* and *Theodoret* (*h*) affirm *Ignatius* to have ſucceeded immediatly not to *Evodius* but to *Peter* himſelf. But waveing theſe Things, I anſwer Thirdly, That the Epiſtles of *Ignatius* are ſo far from teſtifying favourably for the Modern Epiſcopacy, that they quite deſtroy it, and the Principles upon which it is pretended to be built. This I hope to make good to every Man's Conviction by the FOUR following Particulars.

In the Firſt Place. Suppoſeing that *Epiſcopacy* had obtain'd at the Time when *Ignatius* wrote His Epiſtles, yet this is ſo far from being an Argument that it had obtain'd in the Apoſtolick Age, that the whole ſtrain of theſe Epiſtles are an Evidence of the contrary. This, I am aware, will at firſt be thought a very ſurprizing Aſſertion: But I ſhall make it good from an unexception-

[h] *Chryſoſt.* de Tranſlat. S. *Ignatij.* *Theodor.* de Immut. Dial. I.

able Hand, I mean Mr. *Dodwell* (*i*). The matter in Short is this. The *Presbyterians* had oftimes excepted againſt the *Ignatian* Epiſtles either as not Genuine, or at leaſt as vitiat and corrupted, On this Head, becauſe they inſiſt ſo much on the Abſolute Power of the Biſhop; they could not believe that ſuch *Rhodomontado* Expreſſions as are uſed on that Subject were conſiſtent with the Spirit, Character or Circumſtances of *Ignatius* when he wrote his Epiſtles. Mr. *Dodwell* ſaw the Force of this Objection; and therefore carefully applies Himſelf to take it off. But how does he it? Plainly by telling us, that the Reaſon, why *Ignatius* inſiſted ſo much 'on the Power of the Biſhop, was becauſe *Epiſcopacy* was an Or-'der but *newly* introduced into the Church, that therefore it was 'neceſſary that *with all His might* He ſhould aſſert their *new* Rights, 'and urge and eſtabliſh a Power formerly *unknown*. In a Word, *Epiſcopacy* was not inſtituted, ſays Mr. *Dodwell*, till the Year CVI. *Ignatius* wrote His Epiſtles in the Year 116 ſaies Biſhop *Lloyd*, in the Year 110 ſaies *Euſebius*, in the Year 107 ſaies Biſhop *Uſher*. By the longeſt of theſe Accounts Epiſcopacy was but of *ten* years ſtanding when *Ignatius* wrote, and by the ſhorteſt of them but of *one*. And now let the Reader ſay if theſe Epiſtles will prove that Epiſcopacy obtain'd in the Apoſtolick Age.

Secondly, I ask Mr. *Rhind* if any where in theſe Epiſtles He finds a Biſhop that had moe than one Congregation under His Charge. The Epiſcopal Writers have oftimes been called on to ſhew this; they have never done it to this Day, and I believe no wiſe man will ever attempt it: For Nothing is more plain from theſe Epiſtles, than that the Biſhops whole Charge met in one Place and communicate at one Altar. Whether then does this look like the *Scots* Presbyterian or the *Engliſh* Dioceſan Biſhop?

Thirdly, Through all the *Ignatian* Epiſtles, as I have ſhewn before, the *Presbyters* are always ſaid to repreſent the Apoſtles, the *Biſhops* never. Now upon this I ask 1ſt How Mr. *Rhind*'s Argument

[*i*] Parænes. Sect. 25. p. 105. 106. Hinc etiam conſtat, nullam fuiſſe (quam Crediderunt *Ignatianarum* Epiſtolarum Adverſarij, noſtrarum rationum neſcij) Affectationem, immo neceſſarium fuiſſe, ut *novæ Πρωτοκαθέδρων* jura enixis viribus aſſererentur.---- Nam *primæ* Poteſtatis illius in Epiſcopos devolutione magis neceſſarium erat ut *ignota antea Poteſtas* urgeretur atque ſtabileretur.-----Noſtræ autem Rationes oſtendunt jam *nuperam* fuiſſe illam Epiſcoporum Poteſtatem, Cum *adeo* illam *Commendaret* Ignatius.

ment holds that the *Bishops* succeed the *Apostles*, and the *Presbyters* the *Seventy*. 2dly, If the *Presbyters* succeed the *Apostles*, how is it possible but that they must have the Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction as well as of Preaching and dispensing the Sacraments? Surely the Apostles had it, how then can the Presbyters their Successors want it? 3dly, Seeing by the *Ignatian* Doctrine the *Presbyters* were in Place of the Apostles, How is it True that the Presbyters cannot do any Pastoral act in their own Right, but as the Bishops Delegates. The Apostles had our Lord Jesus Christ for their Immediate Superior, why should it be otherwise with the *Presbyters* their Successors?

Fourthly. The *Ignatian* Presbytry had a Share in the Government, as appears from many Places of these Epistles. 'And that being Subject to your Bishop and his *Presbytry*, ye may be wholly and thoroughly sanctified (*k*). Obeying your Bishop and the *Presbytry* with intire Affection (*l*). But be ye united to your Bishop and those who preside over you, *that is*, *the Presbyters* (*m*). So neither do ye any thing without your Bishop and *Presbyters* (*n*). But he that is without, that is, does any Thing without the Bishop *Presbyters* and Deacons, is not pure in his Conscience (*o*). Being Subject to your Bishop as to the Command of God and so likewise to the *Presbytry*. (*p*) Thus it was in the *Ignatian* Times. But where now is there any such Thing as this in the Church of *England* which Mr. *Rhind* has joined? Are not the Presbyters entirely deprived of the Exercise of Discipline? Nay are not the *Lay Chancellours* risen up against the Bishops themselves their Creaters? Have they not engrossed the Discipline wholly into their Hands? Hear Dr. *Burnet* (*q*) even before he became Revolutioner. 'Our Ecclesiastical Courts, *saith he*, 'are not in the Hands of our Bishops and their Clergy, but put over 'to the *Civilians*, where too often Fees are more strictly looked after 'than the Correction of Manners.---Excommunication has become a 'Kind of Secular Sentence, and is hardly now considered as a Spiritual Censure, being judged and given out by Lay Men, and often upon

[k] Ep. to the Ephes. Sect. II. [l] Ibid. Sect XX. [m] Ep. to the Magnes. Sect. VI. [n] Ibid. Sect. VII. [o] Ep. to the Tral. Sect. VII. [p] Ibid. Sect. XIII. [q] Preface to II. Vol. Hist. Reform.

' upon Grounds, which, to speak moderatly, do not merit so severe and ' dreadfull a Sentence. Before I go further I cannot but take Notice that Mr. *Rhind*, in summing up the Evidence from *Ignatius*'s Epistles, has not dealt fairly when he saies p. 94. *That this Exercise of the* Episcopal *Authority over subordinate Presbyters and Deacons was not peculiar to the Churches to which S.* Ignatius *directed his Epistles, but did* EXTEND (*to use that Saints Words*) *to the utmost Bounds of the Earth*; *which*, saith he, *in my Opinion, asserts the* UNIVERSAL *Exercise of the* Episcopal *Office.* Did *Ignatius* use that Word EXTEND, I mean the *Greek* that signifies it? If not how can the UNIVERSAL EXERCISE of the Episcopal Office be inferred upon it? And yet 'tis certain first that He did not use it but a Greek Word * which signifies *Defined* or *Appointed*, and that too without any Mention *of the Earth* in the Clause. Secondly, That Bishops did not at that Time *extend* to the utmost Bounds of the Earth: For, Mr. *Dodwell* gives it as the very Reason why *Ignatius* insisted so much on the Episcopal Authority, because it had not yet universally obtained. ' The Power of the Bishops, *saith He* (*r*), was ' so long to be urged till it should be universally received, and ' Men were brought in Use to obey it. Why then did Mr. *Rhind* in his *Reasoning* use the Word EXTEND instead of APPOINTED, especially when before p. 93 He had used the Word APPOINTED in *citeing?* Did he not design to take Advantage of his Reader's Inadvertency? But how shall his Conclusion of the *Universal Exercise* of the Episcopal Office in *Ignatius*'s Time stand, when it is founded upon a false Bottom? This now is our first Defence against the *Ignatian* Epistles, that they quite destroy the Modern Episcopacy and the Principles on which it is built, which I must needs still believe they do, till I have got a satisfying Answer to the former Particulars. I add

Secondly, That these *Ignatian* Epistles, *as to the main of the Controversie*, contain Nothing contrary to the Presbyterian Scheme. And it is

---

* ὡς καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὁρισθέντες

[r] Parænes. Sect. 25. p. 106. Tantisper certe urgenda erat nova illa Potestas dum a Subditis passim reciperetur, & dum illius Obsequio Homines assuevissent.

is a great Encouragement to me to venture on that Assertion that so great a Man as *Stillingfleet* has done it before me. 'In all those 'thirty five Testimonies, *saith he* (*s*), produced out of *Ignatius*'s Epistles 'for Episcopacy, I can meet but with one which is brought to prove 'the least Semblance of an Institution of Christ for Episcopacy, and 'if I be not much deceived, the Sense of that Place is clearly mista-'ken too---. I said, *as to the main of the Controversie*, to prevent trifling in any Body that shall attempt to answer this. Mr. *Rhind* alledges on the Presbyterians that they affirm *the Ignatian Bishop to correspond to their Parish Minister*; *the Presbyters and Deacons to their Ruling Elders and Deacons*. p. 101. I do not know any Presbyterian Author that ever wrote so widely, I do not believe ever any of them did, and want to have them named. But if any of them ever did so, I here enter my Dissent from them. 'Tis certain the *Presbyterian* Deacons do not correspond to the *Ignatian* Deacons, because the *Ignatian* Deacons do not correspond to the *Scripture* Deacons. 'Tis evident from *Acts 6* that the Deacons were instituted to *serve Tables*, and take Care of the Poor and of the Churches Stock. The very Reason of their Institution was the giveing Relief to the Apostles, who could not at once attend *the Word of God and serve Tables*. And to this Mr. *Dodwell* accords (*t*) declareing *that the first Institution of the Office of Deaconship was for the distributing of the Treasures of the Church*. But such is not the Ignatian Deacon: *For*, saith He (*v*), *the Deacons are not the Ministers of Meat and Drink but of the Church*. 'Tis certain likewise that the Presbyterian Parish Minister does not correspond to the *Ignatian* Bishop as to His *Intensive* Power. The Presbyterians believe that the Power ascribed to the *Ignatian* Bishop is greater than ought to be allowed to any Creature that is not under an Infallible Conduct. For Instance, when it is said † *Whatsoever the Bishop approves is acceptable to God*. But then I affirm that the *Ignatian* Bishop as to His *Extensive* Power corresponds better to the *Presbyterian* Parish Minister than to the *English* Diocesan Bishop, seeing, as I observed before, the *Ignatian* Bishop's whole Charge did meet in one Place and communicate at one

[s] Irenic. p. 309. Edit. I. [t] One Priesthood, Chap. XII. Sect. 3. p. 336. [v] Ep. to the Trall. Sect. 2. † Ep. to the Smyrn. Sect. VIII.

one Altar. I affirm likewise, that there is not the least Hint in all the *Ignatian* Epistles of an Imparity among the Pastors of the Church, I take *Pastors* here in the current Ecclesiastical Sense of that Word for *such as labour in the Word and Doctrine*, for otherwise I know that the Word *Pastor* may signifie any Officer or Governour whatsomever.

And this now brings me to the main Point in Debate: For I know the Reader will presently ask, what I make of the *Ignatian* Presbyters, were not they Pastors in the current Ecclesiastical Sense of that Word? I affirm positively that there is no Hint in all the *Ignatian* Epistles that they were, and that nothing Mr. *Rhind* has produced proves that there is any such Hint in them. He has but two Arguments for that Purpose, and that I may not wrong him, I shall set them down fully in his own Words.

The first runs thus p. 103. 'I say, that the Presbyters mentioned 'by *Ignatius*, did preach and administrate the Sacraments: Thus 'in the Epistle to the *Smyrn.* Let that Eucharist be looked upon as 'firm and just, which is either offered by the Bishop, or by him to 'whom the Bishop has given his Consent. *Again*, 'Tis not lawfull 'without the Bishop, neither to Baptize nor to celebrate the Sacra-'ment, but whatsoever he shall approve of, that is also well pleasing 'to God; which plainly proves, that though the Bishop was invest-'ed with the Chief Power of Dispensing these Holy Ordinances, yet 'might the Presbyters perform them by his Allowance, and there-'fore they were not Elders according to the *Presbyterian* Fashion; see-'ing they pretend to no such Power, nor can their Parish Minister '(who, they say, is the true *Ignatian* Bishop) communicate the same 'to them. Thus he.

Before I answer directly, I must give a literal Translation of the two Passages produced by him from the Original *. The first runs thus, *Let that Eucharist be held firm, which is under the Bishop* or to whom he shall permit. The other runs thus, *It is not lawfull without the Bishop either to Baptize, or to make a Love Feast. But whatever he shall approve*

* Ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον οὖσα, ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ. Οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστιν χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν, οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν· ἀλλ' ὃ ἂν ἐκεῖνος δοκιμάσῃ, τοῦτο καὶ τῷ Θεῷ εὐάρεστον.

prove, the same is also well-pleasing to God. Now I ask 1st, Is there in either of these Testimonies the least Intimation that the Presbyters did *Preach*? No. Neither the Word *Preaching*, nor any Thing Equivalent to it, is mentioned in either of them: Nor indeed any where else in these Epistles is *Preaching* ascribed to the Presbyter. 2dly, Is there the least Intimation in either of these Testimonies that the Presbyters *administrate the Sacraments*? No. *Presbyters* are not so much as named in either of them, nor is there the least Hint given that either Baptizeing or giveing the Eucharist was more peculiar to the Presbyters than to any of the Laity. Upon the whole then it does not appear by these Testimonies, that the *Ignatian* Presbyters could either *Preach* or *administrate the Sacraments.*

I know nothing can be reponed to this, unless it be said, that it ought to be supposed that the Bishop would not give his *Consent* to any to Baptize or to make a Love Feast but to the Presbyters. But this is a plain begging the Question, and is contrary to what the Fathers have taught us: For, saith *Ambrose* or *Hilary* the *Roman* Deacon who wrote the Commentaries annexed to *Ambrose*'s Works (*x*) 'that the '*Christian People* might encrease and be multiplied, in the Beginning 'it was allowed to all Persons both to preach the Gospel, and to Bap'tize, and to explain the Scriptures in the Church. And particularly as to Baptism 'tis known that it was usually dispensed by *Lay* Persons and *Tertullian* expressly asserts the Lawfulness of it, as we shall Hear when we come to his Testimony; and the forecited *Ambrose* or *Hilary* relates the Practice of it even in the Presence of the Apostles. 'At first, *saith he (y)*, all Taught, and all Baptized on whatever Days 'or Times Occasion offered. For *Philip* did not wait for a Time 'or a Day in which he might Baptize the *Eunuch*, neither did he in'terpose a Fast. Nor did *Paul* and *Silas* delay but that they instant'ly Baptized the Jaylour with all his House. Neither had *Peter* 'Deacons, or sought a Day wherein to Baptize *Cornelius* with all his

[x] Ut ergo crescerent Plebs & multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia concessum est & evangelizare, & Baptizare, & Scripturas in Ecclesia explanare. Ambros. Vol. 1. Tom. 3. p. 239. in Ephes. cap. IV.

[y] Primum enim omnes docebant, & omnes baptizabant, quibuscunque diebus fuisset Occasio. Nec enim Philippus tempus quæsivit aut diem quo Eunuchum baptizaret, neque Jejunium interposuit. Neque Paulus & Silas tempus distulerunt quo Optionem Carceris baptizarent cum omnibus suis. Neque Petrus Diaconos habuit, aut diem quæsivit quando Cornelium cum omni Domo ejus baptizavit. Nec ipse, sed baptizare jussit fratribus qui cum illo ierant ad Cornelium ab Joppe. *Ambros.* ubi supra

'House: Nor did he himself Baptize them, but commanded the 'Brethren who came with Him from *Joppa* to do it. Thus he. One then might as well say that the *English* Midwives are *Presbyters*, because they have at least the Connivance of the Bishop to Baptize; as say, that these in *Ignatius* who Baptized with the Bishop's Consent were Presbyters, when not only Deacons might do it; which Mr. *Rhind* himself will not deny, but every *Lay* Person too. And as to the other Sacrament viz. the Eucharist there is no Mention in either of the two Testimonies of *Consecrating* it, and as for the *Distribution* of it, 'tis certain that not only Deacons but even Lay Persons used to be employed about it. Thus *Chrysostom* tells us (z) 'That it was given in Charge to the Deacons 'to keep notoriously unworthy Persons from the Table, and that 'the Holy Gifts should not be distributed to them. And by the Fourth Council of *Carthage* (a) it is allowed *that in Case of Necessity the Deacon, the Presbyter being present, may being ordered give the Eucharist of the Body of Christ to the People.* And *Justin Martyr* (b) tells us that it was usual in his Days for the Deacons to carry the Eucharist to the Absents. But not the Deacons only, but even Lay Persons were sometimes thus employed. Thus *Eusebius* tells us (c) of *Serapion* that desireing the Eucharist on his Death Bed, He sent his Grand Child to bring a Presbyter to administer it to him. The Presbyter happened to be sick and was not able to come; but he sent the Eucharist with the Boy ordering him to administer it to his Grand Father which accordingly was done. And who knows not that the Eucharist used to be given to Infants after their Baptism? But I very much doubt if there was always a Church Officer at the doing of it. Plainly the Elements used to be consecrated by the Bishop, and the People oft times kept them, and by his allowance gave them to others. How then does it appear from the Testimonies produced by Mr. *Rhind*, that the *Ignatian Presbyters* did either Preach or Administrate the Sacraments, when there

[z] Homil. 82. in Evang. Matth.
[a] Ut Diaconus præsente Presbytero Eucharistiam Corporis Christi Populo, si necessitas Cogat, jussus Eroget. Can. 38. Caranza. Sum. Concil.
[b] Apol. 2. p. 97. Edit. Colonicæ. 1686.
[c] Hist. Eccles. Lib. 6. Cap. 43.

there is neither Mention in either of them of *Presbyters*; nor, suppose there were, is there any Thing ascribed to them but what might be and was frequently done by *Deacons*, yea by every *Lay* Christan? So much for his first Argument.

His Second is in these Words p. 103, 104. 'But I add, that 'the Presbyters in St. *Ignatius*'s Days, were Subject to the Bishop: 'This does fully appear from the Testimonies formerly cited: If 'then these Presbyters were such as the Modern Ruling Elders, 'either this their Subjection must relate to the Bishop's Superior 'Power in the Administration of Sacraments and Ordination, or 'to the Power of Jurisdiction: Not the former; for how can they 'be accountable in these respects, when they are not supposed to 'be at all concern'd in these Matters; and to say that this Sub-'jection relates to Acts of Jurisdiction, is to destroy that Parity 'of Power, of which all Presbyters, whether Preaching or Rul-'ing are equally possessed according to the *Presbyterians*. Thus he.

The Answer to which is very easie, and therefore may be very Short. Through all the *Ignatian* Epistles there is no Subjection required from the Presbyters to the Bishop but what every Presbyterian Ruling Elder will own, and that too, agreeably to Presbyterian Principles, to be his Duty to pay to the Minister. Every Presbyterian Ruling Elder owns the Minister to be an Officer Superior to himself as having the Key of *Doctrine* as well as of *Discipline*, whereas himself has that of *Discipline* only. Every Presbyterian Ruling Elder gives, though not a Negative, yet the Precedency to the Minister in all Acts of Jurisdiction. In a Word every Presbyterian Ruling Elder is ready to yeild *all Reverence* to the Minister, which is all that is required of the *Ignatian* Presbyter to the Bishop. So much for his *Second* Argument. And this is our *Second* Defence against the *Ignatian* Epistles, That, *as to the Main of the Controversie*, they contain Nothing contrary to the *Presbyterian* Scheme. And I hope every Reader is satisfied that there is no more needfull on this Subject. Yet because Mr. *Rhind* mentions another Defence which the Presbyterians make against them viz. *That these Epistles are either Spurious or Corrupted*: Tho' I do not think such a Defence needfull, yet I homologate the same, and justify my Brethren in it. And therefore

In the Third Place. I assert that these Epistles which go under the Name of *Ignatius* either are not Genuine, or at least that they are vitiate and interpolated. For proveing this, I am not to insist on what the Learned *Stillingfleet* has suggested (*d*) that the Story of transporting *Ignatius* from *Antioch* where he was condemned, to *Rome* where he suffered, and of his many Excursions by the Way, and of the Freedom he got to write these Epistles, smells rank of the Legend; seeing *Ignatius* himself informs us that *He was bound to ten Leopards, that is to say, to such a Band of Souldiers; who, though treated with all manner of Kindness, were the worse for it.* Waveing this, I affirm that nothing Mr. *Rhind* has advanced, though he has taken very great pains on this Particular, is in the least sufficient to vindicate them.

He insists on these Six Topicks. I. That several Fathers do mention these Epistles, and cite sundry Passages from them which are to be found in those now extant. II. That *Calvin* who was a Party was the first who ever alledged such an Interpolation. III. That at least *Vossius*'s and *Usher*'s Editions of these Epistles are the Genuine Issue of that Holy Father. IV. That such an Interpolation was hardly if at all Practicable. V. That the alledging that these Passages which assert the Episcopal Authority are Interpolations is a mean begging of the Question. VI. That no one can give a reasonable account why any such Interpolation should have been attempted. Of each of these in order.

I. He alledges p. 95. 96. S. *Polycarp*, *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Eusebius*, *Athanasius* and *Theodoret*. *All which*, saith he, *with many other Authors do mention these Epistles and cite sundry Passages from them which are to be found in those now extant.* To which it is answered, that this proves only that *Ignatius* did write Epistles, and that some Sentences of them are still preserved. But how will it follow thence, either that these Epistles are Genuine, or that they are not vitiated? Especially when we consider. 1st, That *all* the Passages cited from *Ignatius* by the Ancients are not to be found even in the best Editions of him which we have. For Instance, there is a Passage

[d] Ep. to the *Romans* Sect. 5.

Paſſage cited by *Ierom* thus (*f*). *Ignatius an Apoſtolick Man and Martyr writes boldly, The Lord choſed Apoſtles who were Sinners above all Men.* Now, in which of the *Ignatian* Epiſtles is there any ſuch Paſſage to be found? Dr. *Hammond* anſwers (*g*), *That it may well be his* ſaying, *though it is not found in theſe Epiſtles: Juſt as Our Saviour ſpake many Things which are not written in the Goſpells.* But this is a meer Whim; for *Ierom* is not teſtifieing about what *Ignatius ſpoke* but about what he *wrote.* This is a pretty good Preſumption that the Epiſtles are at leaſt mutilate. 2dly, If the Ancients citeing of him be an Argument, Is it not very ſtrange that no one of them has cited theſe Paſſages that are inſiſted on in Favours of Epiſcopacy? Is it not ſtrange that his Authority was never inſiſted on in the Diſpute with *Aerius* where there was ſo fair Occaſion for it? Wou'd not one be tempted from this to think that ſuch Paſſages are foiſted in? 3dly, Some of theſe Expreſſions that the Ancients cite which are now found in theſe Epiſtles are neither cited as from *Ignatius,* nor as from *Epiſtles* either of his or any Body elſe. For Inſtance, that Paſſage which Mr. *Rhind* p. 95. cites from *Irenæus, I am the Wheat of God and ſhall be ground by the Teeth of wild Beaſts, that I may become the Bread of Jeſus Chriſt,* though it is found in *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles, yet *Irenæus* does not ſay that it was *written,* much leſs that it was written in an *Epiſtle,* leaſt of all that it was written in any Epiſtle from *Ignatius,* but only indefinitly, *One of our Brethren hath ſaid* (*h*), which *Euſebius* underſtands of *Ignatius.*

II. He alledges p. 97. that *the* Presbyterians *cannot name an Author who ever alledged ſuch an interpolation before* Calvin, *whom all Men know to have been a Party.* And this (he thinks) might be allowed a *ſufficient* Anſwer. This *ſufficient* Anſwer of his is ſo groſs an impoſeing upon People's Underſtanding, that I am even amazed he ſhou'd have been ſo very Prodigal of his Credit. The Matter is plainly this. *Calvin* wrote that excellent Book of his *Inſtitutions* in the Year 1536. There-

[f] Ignatius vir Apoſtolicus et Martyr ſcribit Audacter. Eligit Dominus Apoſtolos, qui ſuper omnes Homines Peccatores erant. Hierom Dial. 3 con. Pelag. [g] Anſ. to the Animadver. on the Diſſert. Chap. 3. Sect. 1.

[h] Quemadmodum quidam de noſtris dixit, propter Martyrium in Deum adjudicatus ad Beſtias. Quoniam frumentum &c.

Therein he has Occaſion to defend the Doctrine of the ever Bleſſed Trinity, againſt which Doctrine the *Antitrinitarians* objected the Authority and Teſtimony of *Ignatius*. *Calvin* in Anſwer thereto rejects (*i*) the ſaid pretended Authority, and gives a very bad Character of the Work. 'As for *Ignatius* (*ſaith he*) let 'theſe who attribute any Thing to his Authority prove that the 'Apoſtles made a Law about Lent and ſuch like Corruptions: 'There is Nothing more ſtinking than that Traſh which is pub-'liſhed under the Name of *Ignatius*. Whence the Impudence of 'ſuch is the leſs to'erable, who furniſh themſelves with ſuch For-'geries wherewith to impoſe on the World. Now, will the Reader ask, Did *Calvin* find any ſuch thing in *Ignatius* as Expreſſions againſt the Doctrine of the Trinity, a pretended Apoſtolick Law for obſerving *Lent* and ſuch like Corruptions? Yes indeed, in the *Old* Editions, which alone were known in *Calvin*'s Time, there was a great deal of ſuch Stuff; as even *Coke* a Church of *England* Divine has noticed (*k*). Thus, in the Epiſtle to thoſe of *Tarſus*, it is mentioned as one of the Hereſies diſſeminate by Satan, *that Chriſt was God over all.* And in the Epiſtle to the *Philippians*, it is denyed *that the Word which was made Fleſh dwelt in Man.* And it is aſſerted, that 'if any faſt on the Sabbath Day he is a Murderer 'of Chriſt; *and that* if any keep Eaſter with the Jews he is par-'taker with thoſe who ſlew the Lord and his Apoſtles. And in the Epiſtle to the *Antiochians*, Wives are diſcharged to call their Huſbands by their own proper Name. In a word, the Divines of the Church of *Rome* cited theſe Epiſtles to prove that the Bleſſed Virgin *Mary* was void of all Sin. I hope it is plain that as ſome of theſe Things were great *Fooleries*, ſo others of them were Groſs *Hereſies*. And muſt then *Calvin* be traduced as a *Party-Man* becauſe he would not Sacrifice the fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtianity to the Reputation of *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles? But let us hear Dr. *Wake* Biſhop of *Lincoln* (*l*). 'Before I enter upon that Account

[*i*] Ignatium quod obtendunt, ſi velint quicquam habere momenti, probent Apoſtolos legem tuliſſe de Quadrageſima & ſimilibus Corruptelis: Nihil Nænijs illis quæ ſub Ignatij nomine editæ ſunt, putidius. Quo minus tolerabilis eſt eorum impudentia qui talibus Larvis ad fallendum ſe inſtruunt. *Calvin. Inſtit.* Lib. 1. Cap. 13. Sect. 29

[*k*] Cenſura. quorundam Script. vet. (1) The Genuine Epiſtles of the Apoſtolical Fathers II. Edit. p. 30.

'count which it will be fitting for me to give of the Epistles of 'S. *Ignatius*, it will be necessary for me to observe, that there have 'been considerable Differences in the *Editions* of the Epistles of this 'Holy Man, no less than in the Judgment of our latter Criticks 'concerning them. To pass by the *first*, and most imperfect of 'them, the *best* that for a *long* Time was *extant*, contained not 'only a *great* Number of Epistles *falsly* ascribed to this Author, 'but even those that were Genuine so altered and corrupted, *that 'it was hard to find out the true* Ignatius *in them*. The *first* that began 'to remedy this Confusion, and to restore this great Writer to 'His primitive Simplicity, was our most Reverend and Learned 'Arch-Bishop *Usher*, in his *Edition* of them at *Oxford* Anno 1644. Thus Dr. *Wake*. Now if, by the Judgment of the most Learned of the Episcopalians, there was not so much as any tolerable Copy of the *Ignatian* Epistles *extant* till the Year 1644, that is, 108 Years after *Calvin* had excepted against them; who that has not thrown off all Modesty would talk at Mr *Rhind*'s Rate, or would seek to blast the Fame of that Great Man *Calvin* in a Matter wherein the Episcopalians themselves have justified him; or would represent him as a *Party Man*, when he was defending the Common Cause of Christianity. But it seems *Ignatius*'s Epistles must stand, though the Doctrine of the *Trinity* and the *Divinity* of our Blessed Saviour should Sink. Dear Episcopacy, what art thou not worth! Who would not Sell even his Religion to purchase *Thee*, without which all Religion is Nothing?

III. He adds p. 97. 'That however the Name of the Holy 'Man *Ignatius* may have been abused by ignorant or designing 'Men, who fathered upon him their own spurious or interpolated 'Work, yet the Epistles of *Usher*'s and *Vossius*'s Edition are his Genuine Issue. But does not Dr. *Wake* himself own (*m*), 'That no 'one that Reads (even these Editions of) them with *any* care or Judg-'ment can make any doubt of it, but that Letters or Words have 'been mistaken, and perhaps even Pieces of some Sentences too 'corrupted. And does not every one know what a great Alteration the Mistake of one Letter sometimes will make? I shall give one

[m] Ubi Supra. p. 2.

one signal Instance of this, which is related by Dr. *Wake* (*n*). In the *Acts* of the Martyrdom of S. *Polycarp*, as set out from the *Barroccian* Manuscript by Archbishop *Usher*, there is this Passage. 'That the 'Souldier or Officer having struck his Launce into the Side of the 'Saint, there came forth a *Pigeon*, together with a great Quantity of 'Blood. Here is a fair Plump Miracle. A *Pigeon* comeing out of a Man's Side being a very curious Sight; but now by the Alteration of one single Letter in the Original †, it dwindles into no Miracle at all; and the Passage imports only that there came out of his *left* Side a great Quantity of Blood, the *Greek* Word which signifies the *Left*, and that which signifies a *Pigeon* being near in Sound to one another. If the Mistake of one Letter can make such a Change, what may the Mistake of a Word do? And what may the Corruption of a Piece of a Sentence do? But Mr. *Rhind* is a Writer of Courage who sticks at nothing.

IV. He alledges p. 99 *That such an Interpolation was hardly, if at all, Practicable.* But pray why *not Practicable*? For 1*st*. Did Mr. *Rhind* never hear of the Ignorance or Knavery of Transcribers? Does he not know that the Works of the Fathers were a long Time in the Hands of Monks or others of the like Stamp, who, with all their Religion, were yet so familiar and used such Freedoom with the Fathers, as not only to pare their Nails that they might not be scratched by them; But even to alter their Habit and Dress, to fit them to the Modes of their own Times, and make 'em fashionable (*o*)? Even the *Vossian Greek* Manuscript is not judged to be above eleven Hundred Years Old, that is, about 500 Years latter than the Times of *Ignatius*; and how corrupt the Church was about the Six Hundred Year of God needs not be told. 2*dly*, Is it not a very good Argument that the *Ignatian* Epistles *might* be interpolated, when it is plain beyond Contradiction that they actually *were* interpolated? What Security had Bishop *Usher*'s or *Isaac Vossius*'s Copies against the Possibility of Interpolation, any more than other Copies? Why, saith Mr.

---

[n] Ubi Supra p. 58. 59.

† Ἐξηλθε Περισερὰ
Ἐξηλθ' ἐπ' Ἀριστερᾶ

(o) Sherlock's Preservative against Popery. Part. I. Chap. II Sect. 3. p. 74.

Mr. *Rhind* p. 98, ‘ Conſidering the great Simplicity of theſe pious ‘ Times, it is ſcarce credible that the greateſt Ornaments of the Chri- ‘ ſtian Church after the Apoſtles were wicked enough to be guilty ‘ of ſo baſe a Fraud, or Weak enough to be impoſed on by theſe ‘ who might be thus Wicked. Is not this a Powerfull Orator, who will needs harangue People out of Matter of Fact? Let the *Great Ornaments* of the Church be as far from being either *Wicked* or *Weak* as Mr. *Rhind* pleaſes, yet that ſome Perſons were ſo *Wicked* as to be guilty of ſuch a Fraud, and others ſo *Weak* as to be impoſed on by it, is ſo far from being incredible, that it is confeſſed on all Hands, that not only that, but even Twenty other Things of the like Nature have been done. And all Mr. *Rhind*'s Reaſonings againſt the Poſſibility or Practicableneſs of interpolating *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles labour under this one ſmall Abſurdity, that if they prove any Thing, they will prove that no falſe Writeing could have been palmed on the Church, nor any Genuine one Corrupted. And whence then came ſo many ſpurious Pieces, ſuch as *Abgarus*'s Letter to our Bleſſed Saviour, and our Saviour's Anſwer to Him; which *Euſebius* tells us, with as much Confidence as he does the Story of the *Ignatian* Epiſtles, he had faithfully Tranſlated out of the *Syriack* Language as he found them in the Archives of *Edeſſa*? Whence came St. *Paul*'s Epiſtle to the *Laodiceans?* Whence came the Letters that paſſed 'twixt *Seneca* and Him? Whence came St. *Peter*'s, St. *Mark*'s, St. *Matthew*'s and St. *James*'s Liturgies, which Mr. *Rhind* * makes an Argument of, as being of conſiderable Antiquity, though Dr. *Wake* (*p*) twenty Years ago declared, that the learned World ſeemed to be univerſally agreed about the Falſity of them. Not to ſpeak of many others mentioned by *Hottinger*, *Coke*, *Du pin* and Dr. *Wake*, whence came the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, which Mr. *Whiſton* an Advocate for Epiſcopacy aſſerts (*q*) to be *the moſt Sacred of the Canonical Books of the New Teſtament*? Is there any Age can be named upon which moe falſe Pieces were fathered than the *Firſt* and *Second*? And what Charm then was there in *Ignatius*'s Name, that none ſhould be fathered on him? Or why ſhould

* Sermon on Liturgy p. 14. [p] Ubi ſupra Firſt Edit. p. 145. [q] Eſſay upon the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions.

we believe there were not, when the Contrary is Manifeſt and confeſſed by all the World? For let us take a ſhort View of 'em.

The *Ignatian* Epiſtles, ſaies *Coke* (*r*), a Church of *England* Divine, were firſt publiſhed at *Strasburg* Anno 1502. And though they are now only *Seven*, yet then they were eleven in Number. In proceſs of Time it ſeems they begot another among 'em: For when in the Year 1562 they were publiſhed in *Greek* and *Latine* at *Paris*, they were found to be *Twelve*. Atlength as if the Bleſſing *Be Fruitfull and Multiply* had been pronounced on them, they encreaſed to the Number of *Fifteen* with a Letter alſo annexed from the Virgin *Mary* to *Ignatius*. Nor did they alter in Number only, but in Bulk too: For in ſome Editions ſome of the Epiſtles were twice as large as in others. Notwithſtanding all this Variety, yet ſome of the Church of *Rome*, *Caniſius* by Name, inſulted the World, as our Epiſcopal Friends do us now, with a great deal of Scorn, becauſe they doubted of any of theſe Epiſtles. But the World is never all at once to be bullied out of their Senſes. *Maſtræus* a *Pariſian* Doctor publiſhed a new Edition of them, and without Scruple diſcarded *Four* of them as Apocryphal viz. two to St. *John* the *Evangeliſt*, one to the Virgin *Mary*, and her Letter to him. Yet even ſo the remaining *Twelve* did not pleaſe learned Men. Archbiſhop *Uſher* has aſſerted and proves (*s*) that *Six* of them were ſpurious, *Six* of them mixed, and ſo *none* of them ſincere and Genuine. *Vedelius* in the Year 1623 publiſhed an Edition of the *Ignatian* Epiſtles at *Geneva*; but he went ſo near to Work, and caſtigate them ſo ſeverely; that the Church of *England* Divines were not pleaſed with him (*t*), as indeed they ſeldom are with any Thing that comes from *that* Quarter, or almoſt any other except their own. Hitherto then the *Ignatian* Epiſtles made but a ſorry Figure with all who were not willing to Sacrifice their Senſe to their Zeal. Atlength Archbiſhop *Uſher* fell upon two Copies of them, one in *Cambridge*, another in Biſhop *Montague*'s Library; yet theſe were

[r] Cenſura quorundam Script. Vet. p. 561.
(s) Differt. de Ep. Ign. prolog.
[t] *Montac.* appar. L. 5. Sect. 46. p. 19[illegible].

were not Originals but *Latine* Translations and these too very Barbarous. But then to supply this Defect *Isaac Vossius* found in the *Medicean* Library a *Greek* Manuscript of them and published it at *Amsterdam* 1646. Yet, even after all this, the *Latine* Editions are thought to be best by learned Men; and Archbishop *Usher* doubts whether the *Seventh* Epistle viz. that to *Polycarp* be Genuine or not. Nay he was so ill satisfied with it, that he would not publish it with the rest. *Nor*, saies *Dr.* Wake (*v*), *does* Isaac Vossius *himself deny but that there are some Things in it that may seem to render it suspicious.* Besides, the Epistle to the *Romans* was not found in the *Medicean* or *Florentine* Manuscript; but made up, in some Measure, from the *Latine* Versions, by the *Conjectures* of learned Men, as the same Dr. *Wake* takes Notice (*x*). And even as to the whole of the Epistles, though the *Doctor* translated from the Text of *Vossius*, yet he owns, that where a Place was *manifestly Imperfect* he has sometimes taken the Liberty to express his own *Conjectures*. And now after all let any Man, who can, doubt of the Possibility or Practicableness of these Epistles having been interpolated. But, adds Mr. *Rhind* p. 98, if that should be granted, 'I see not how the '*Presbyterians* can Answer the Enemies of our Religion, who com-'plain that the like Freedom may have been used with the Bible 'in some fundamental Points much about the same Time. Pray, Good Mr. *Rhind*, were the *Ignatian* Epistles as universally spread as the Bible was? Or was it of as great Importance to keep *them* uncorrupted as the *Scriptures*? I do not think but either of these Thoughts much more both jointly, besides what else might be added, would answer the Enemies of our Religion. But, to compleat the Answer, does not Mr. *Rhind* know that there were false Gospels obtruded upon the World, obtruded too in *Ignatius*'s own Days? Does he not know that *Ignatius* himself mistook the *Spurious* Gospel for the *True* one? Does he not know that Mr. *Dodwell* Himself has owned that *Ignatius* was thus mistaken. 'The Holy Martyr, *saith*

[v] Ubi Supra II. Edit. p. 40. [x] Ibid. p. 41.

'*he* (y), did not cautiously enough distinguish 'twixt the Genuine 'Gospel of S. *Matthew* and the interpolated one which the *Ebionit* 'Hereticks now rageing in *Asia* used. Now if false Gospels could be minted in those Days, could not false *Ignatian* Epistles be so too? If so great an Ornament of the Church as *Ignatius* himself could be imposed on by them, why might not others as great Ornaments be imposed on by false or interpolated Pieces fathered on Him?'

V. But Mr. *Rhind* p. 98. 'would know of *His* Adversaries, 'what these Interpolations are. *He* hopes they will not alledge 'that there are any favouring the then or after Heresies; and to 'say that these Passages, which assert the Distinction of Ecclesiasti-'cal Orders and the *Episcopal* Authority, are of this kind, is a 'mean begging of the Question; and so much the meaner still, that 'this can be proven from other Monuments of that Age though '*Ignatius* had never written an Epistle. For Answer. In the first Place, has he read the Authors on this Controversie with a *Scrupulous Exactness* and knows nothing of what these Interpolations are? Why then I recommend him to *Coke*, *Daille*, *Salmasius*, *Blondel*, *Owen*, the *Jus Divinum Ministerij Evangelici*; *L'arroque*, *Jamesson*, *Scultet*, *Rivet*: For why should I repeat what has been so often insisted on? After all that *Hammond*, *Pearson*, *Beveridge*, *Wake* or *Dupin* have advanced in Vindication of these Epistles, I am as well satisfyed as I can be of any Thing, that they are either Counterfit or Corrupted. 2dly, 'Tis true such Interpolations as favoured the then or after Heresies are pretty well weeded out of the *New* Editions: But I have already shewn what Gross Heresies were in the *Old* ones. Now I ask Mr. *Rhind*, how they cou'd creep in when the Genuine Epistles were scattered through *Rome* *Antioch* and several Cities of *Greece*? The Depositaries themselves of this sacred Treasure cou'd have confronted these interpolated Pieces with the Genuine Epistles. They themselves cou'd not be the Criminals: And Persons removed at such a Distance could not

[y] Paræneſ. Sect. 23. p. 98. Nempe in Δοκήτας Hæreticos locum protulerat *Ignatius* ex Evangelio S. *Matthæi*, quo negaviſſe dicebatur Chriſtus ſe Dæmonium eſſe incorporeum. Non ſatis caute diſtinxit S. Martyr inter S. *Matthæi* Evangelium ſincerum, et quale uſurpabant *Ebionæi* jam in *Aſia* graſſantes interpolatum. Hic ergo negant Hæretici, et quidem recte, verba illa in Evangelio fuiſſe quale præd. a S. *Matthæo*.

not have Universally conspired towards such a Deceit: Or if People had been inclined, they wou'd rather have made Bold with the Bible than any inferiour Authority. This is certainly good Reasoning because it is Mr. *Rhind*'s p. 99. And yet how impossible soever it was that such Interpolations *should* creep in; All the World knows and confesses that they *did* creep in. 3dly, Why does Mr. *Rhind* say that it is a *begging of the Question* to alledge that the Expressions about *Episcopacy* are Interpolations? 'Tis so far from a *begging*, that it is a *proving* of the Point directly. For, when the pretended *Ignatius* extravagantly ascribes that to his Bishops (whether they be supposed *Parochial* or *Diocesan* it alters not the Case) which the Apostles never assumed to themselves, 'tis a plain Evidence that the Author of such Expressions was a Man of no Judgment or Conscience, consequently was not the Holy Martyr *Ignatius*. Is not this the very Reason why the Church of *England* Divines themselves have rejected the *old* Editions of these Epistles, because they are so very immoderate in their Exaltation of the Bishop? For Instance, when in the Epistle to the *Trallians* in the *old* Editions the Bishop is said to be *above all Principality and Power, and more excellent than all as far as it is possible for Man to excell.* And when in the Epistle to the *Philadelphians*, all of what sort soever, not only Presbyters, Deacons and the whole Clergy, but all the People, Souldiers, Princes, *Cæsar* Himself are enjoined to perform Obedience to the Bishop. And when in the Epistle to the *Smyrnæans* the Bishop is placed betwixt God and the King, and that by way of Correction of the Words of Scripture *My Son fear God* (the Bishop) *and the King.* Does not Dr. *Hammond* himself (z) call these *immoderate* Expressions? Does he not pronounce the Doctrine contain'd in them to be *rebellious, extravagant* and *senseless*? Does he not conclude that they were inlert by some *Impostor*? And is there not as good Reason why we should except against the *New* Editions, when there is in them a great deal of such extravagant Stuff yet unpurged out? Can any one read even the *Usherian* and *Vossian* Editions, and not observe such a Turgid, affected, Hyperbolical Stile as wou'd never probably

[z] Anf. to the Animadver. on the Differs. Chap. III. Sect. 3.

probably have been uſed by one that had heard and converſed with the Apoſtles, the Character of whoſe Writeings was Simplicity? Is it poſſible one of *Ignatius*'s Spirit and Character could have made that Boaſt (*a*) that he was 'able to know things heaven-'ly, the Orders of Angels, their Conſtitutions, Principalities, things 'Viſible and Inviſible? 'Tis true Dr. *Hammond* (*b*) has criticiſed, and Dr. *Wake* tranſlated that Paſſage to a contrary Senſe; as if He had ſaid *I am not able to know things Heavenly*.....: But both theſe *Doctors* have done Deſpite to the Context as well as forced the Words; for the very Paragraph, in which the Paſſage is, begins thus even according to Dr. *Wake*'s Tranſlation in his ſecond Edition. 'Am I not able to write to you of Heavenly things? But I fear leſt I 'ſhould harm you, who are yet but Babes in Chriſt: (Excuſe me *this* '*Care*;) and leſt perchance being not able to receive them, ye ſhould 'be choaked with them. Could ſo wiſe and Holy a Man have dropped ſuch unguarded Aſſertions as theſe, *Whatſoever the Biſhop approves is acceptable to God. My Soul for ſuch as obey the Biſhop, Presbyters and Deacons.* Is not the very Foundation of Popery, *viz.* an *Implicite Faith*, wrapt up in theſe Expreſſions? 4thly, Why did Mr. *Rhind* ſay that the Epiſcopal Authority can be proven from other *Monuments* of that Age? Where are theſe Monuments? Why did he not produce them, or at leaſt name them? Had Mr. *Rhind* conſidered that things were not to be taken upon his meer Aſſertion; I'm ſure he had found Cauſe to make his Book at leaſt a hundred Times bigger than it is, or to leave out five hundred things he has put into it. *Polycarp* was the moſt contemporary Writer with *Ignatius* that can be named. But though he preſcribes *Deacons* and *Preſbyters* their Duty, yet he does not ſo much as once name *Biſhops*, or any thing equivalent to them above the Degree of *Presbyters*; but plainly ſuppoſes that there were then no other Orders in the Church but thoſe of *Prieſts* and *Deacons*. *Wherefore ye muſt needs abſtain from all theſe things*; *being ſubject to the* Prieſts *and* Deacons, *as unto God and Chriſt* (*c*).

VI. Mr. *Rhind* asks further p. 100. '*Why* any ſuch Interpolation

[a] Ep. to the Trall. Sect. V. [b] Vind. of the Differt. Chap. III. Sect. 3. [c] Ep. to the Philip. Sect. V. VI.

'tion should have been attempted. For if the Testimonies in 'these Epistles that favour the Episcopal Authority are not agree- 'able to the Faith and Practice of the *Ignatian* Age; then many 'living about the Time of the Interpolation might have been 'sensible of this. And as it was next to Impossible to deceive such 'by *Spurious* Epistles so it is highly improbable that they would 'suffer others to be deceived. To this Purpose He. But this is the very same Thing he has said so often over, and which I have so largely exposed. 'Tis beyond Contradiction, and is confessed on all Hands that there were Interpolations made, and that too in the Matter of Episcopacy, whereof I just now gave Instances. This being clear, where is the Necessity of giving either the *How* or the *Why* of such Interpolations? Let Mr. *Rhind* or any of his Brethren give us the *How* or the *Why* these extravagant Expressions in the Matter of Episcopacy which I have just now instanced, and which are confessed to be Interpolations, were foisted into the *Ignatian* Epistles; and I here promise to give Him the *How* or *Why* of all the rest which he thinks do make for his Purpose. So much then for Mr. *Rhind*'s Vindication of the *Ignatian* Epistles.

To conclude it, He referrs his Readers to p. 107. if *any of them are not yet fully Satisfied to the Incomparable Dr.* Pearson's *and the learned* Dupin's *Performances on that Head.* And I referr my Reader to the Authors whom I have already cited. 'Tis true the greatest Men of the Church of *England* have made their utmost Efforts in behalf of these *Ignatian* Epistles: But 'tis as true they have been taken up by as great Men as themselves. 'Tis true likewise the Church of *England* Divines got the last Word: But it is as true, it was, not because they *won* it, but because they *begg'd* it, and owed their keeping the Field not to the Strength of their *Reasons* but to the earnestness of their *Importunity*, as appears from Monsieur *L' Arroque*'s Life prefixed to His *Adversaria Sacra*, from *Walker*'s Translation of *L' Arroque*'s History of the *Eucharist*, and from the Author of the *Elogium* on Monsieur *L' Arroque* in the *Nouvelles de Republique de Lettres.* They have been told of this before (*d*), but

[*d*] Jamesons Naz. Querel. Boyse, Forrester.

but it was needfull to tell them over again, becauſe they ſometimes affect to be dull of Hearing. But enough of *Ignatius*.

CLEMENS ROMANUS

The next Teſtimony He produces is from *Clemens* Biſhop of *Rome*, in his firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* Sect. 40. in which the Argumentative Words are. ‘ For ‘ the Chief Prieſt has His proper Services, and to the Prieſts ‘ their proper Place is appointed; and to the Levites ap- ‘ pertain their proper Miniſtries; and the Lay-Man is confined ‘ within the Bounds of what is commanded to Lay-Men. *From which He inferrs* p. 109. ‘ that to the Biſhop, Presbyters and Dea- ‘ cons in the Chriſtian Church ſuch a Diſtinction of Offices does ‘ belong, as formerly obtain'd among the High Prieſts, and Levites ‘ under the Jewiſh Diſpenſation; which is further confirmed by ‘ the Authority of St. *Ierom* (that pretended Patron of Parity) ‘ who ſaies, *what Aaron and his Sons were, that we know the Biſhops and* ‘ *Presbyters are.* Thus Mr. *Rhind.* Now let us examine all this.

In the firſt Place. Was *Clemens* Biſhop of *Rome* when he wrote this Epiſtle? Hear Dr. *Wake* (*e*) ‘ I conclude then, *ſaith He*, ‘ that this Epiſtle was written ſhortly after the End of the Perſecu- ‘ tion under Nero: Between the LXIV and LXX Year of Chriſt: ‘ And that, as the Learned Defender of this Period ſuppoſes, in the ‘ Vacancy of the See of *Rome*; before the Promotion of S. *Clement* ‘ to the Government of it. Thus He. Plainly, this Epiſtle was writ- ten at leaſt forty two Years before Epiſcopacy was inſtitute, by Mr. *Dodwell's* Accompt; and before there was any ſuch thing as a Bi- ſhop in the World except *James* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* who was in Place of Univerſal Pope. This, I hope, is more than Sufficient to take off *Clement*'s Teſtimony: For how could he ſpeak of a Thing which was not yet in Being. Yet leſt Mr. *Rhind* ſhould complain of Neglect

In the Second Place. I ask, does that Paſſage, which he has cited from *Clemens*, in the leaſt tend to prove that there were then *three* Diſtinct Orders of Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons in the Chriſtian Church? No. He uſes it only by way of General Ac- commodation,

---

[*e*] Ubi Supra I Edit. p. 34.

commodation, that the Christians at *Corinth* shou'd be Subject to their Spiritual Guides; as the *Jews*, whose Polity was yet standing, were to theirs. But it never entered into his Thoughts to run a Parallel 'twixt the Officers in the one and the other Polity. And Mr. *Rhind* might as well have proved that the Officers in the Christian Church corresponded to those in the *Roman* Army, because the same *Clement* saies *Sect.* 37. 'Let us consider the Souldiers who 'obey their Leaders in War, how orderly, readily and with all 'Subjection they execute their Orders. All are not Pretors or Chi-'liarchs, nor Centurions nor Commanders of Fifty. Every one 'performs, in his Order and Station, what is commanded by the 'King and the Leaders. Plainly, one needs no more to convince Him that Episcopacy did not obtain in that Time, but to read *Clement*'s Epistle. The Occasion and Subject of it is this. The People of *Corinth* had raised a Sedition against their Presbyters, and would not be regulated by them. *Clemens* wrote his Epistle on Purpose to compesce that Sedition. 'They are shamefull yea very 'shamefull things beloved, *saith he Sect.* 47, to be heard, that the 'most firm and Ancient Church of the *Corinthians* should by (*or for 'the Sake of*) one or two Persons rise up in Sedition against the Presbyters. Does he ever recommend it to them to referr their Quarrel to the Bishop? Not once. What could be the reason of this? had he been absent, *Clement* might have entreated them to wait his Return. Had he been Dead, he might have desired them to keep Quiet till there were a new one Chosen. Yet *Clemens* advises to neither of these, no not by a Hint. Does he acknowledge any moe than two Orders of Officers in the Church *Bishops* and *Deacons*? No. 'The Apostles, *saith He Sect.* 42. preaching through Countries 'and Cities constituted their first Fruits, having proved them by 'the Spirit, for *Bishops* and *Deacons* of those that should afterwards believe. No mention of *Presbyters* here. Did he not positively own that these *Bishops* were no other than *Presbyters*? Yes. 'For it 'would be our no small Sin, *saith He Sect.* 44, should we cast off 'those from their *Bishoprick* who without Blame and Holily offer 'the Gifts. Blessed are those *Presbyters* who having finished their 'Course have obtain'd a fruitfull and perfect Dissolution. To confirm all. *Grotius* in his Epistle to *Bignonius* proves this Epistle of

Clement to be of undoubted Antiquity. 'Becauſe, *ſaith he* (*f*), no 'where therein does he make Mention of that *Paramount* or *Pe*-'*culiar* Authority of *Biſhops*, which, by Eccleſiaſtical Cuſtom, be-'gan after the Death of *Mark* to be introduced at *Alexandria*; and 'from that Precedent into other places; but He plainly ſhews, as 'the Apoſtle *Paul* had done, that the Churches were governed by 'the Common Council of the *Presbyters*, who are all called *Biſhops* 'both by Him and *Paul*. Thus *Grotius*. But *Grotius* was a *Dutch-Man*. True. But his Reaſoning was right *Engliſh*. 'They, *ſaith the Learned* 'Stillingfleet (*g*) that can find any one ſingle Biſhop at *Corinth* when '*Clement* wrote his Epiſtle to them, muſt have better Eyes and 'Judgment than the deſervedly admired *Grotius*.

In the Third Place. I ask how *Jerom*'s Words, *What* Aaron *and his Sons were that we know the Biſhops and Presbyters are*, contribute to the clearing or confirming *Clement*'s Teſtimony. Why did not Mr. *Rhind* tell where *Jerom* has theſe Words? 'Twas too much Niceneſs in him to think that citeing Authors in ſuch a Caſe as this would be reckoned *Pedantry*: The induſtrious avoiding of it rather deſerves that Name. But the Reaſon is Evident, Mr. *Rhind* knew very well, that if any one would look the Place, He would ſee how abſurdly it were alledged. Plainly the words are taken out of *Jerom*'s famous Epiſtle to *Evagrius*, the Occaſion and Contents of which are theſe. A certain Deacon of the Church of *Rome* had ſtarted a pretty odd Opinion viz. *that Deacons were ſuperiour to Presbyters*. For chaſtiſing the Arrogance of that Spark, *Jerom* wrote the ſaid Epiſtle. 'A Fool, *ſaith he* (*h*) will ſpeak fooliſh Things, I hear 'there is one who has broke out into ſuch a Height of Folly as to 'preferr Deacons to Presbyters; *that is*, to Biſhops. Then He proceeds to confute Him by Arguments. And the great Argument upon which he goes is this. Biſhops and Presbyters were in the Apoſtles

[*f*] Quod uſquam meminit exſortis illius Epiſcoporum auctoritatis, quæ Eccleſiæ Conſuetudine, poſt *Marci* mortem, Alexandriæ, atque eo exemplo, alibi introduci cepit; ſed plane ut *Paulus* Apoſtolus oſtendit, Eccleſias Communi Presbyterorum, qui idem omnes et Epiſcopi ipſi Pauloque dicuntur, conſilio fuiſſe gubernatas. [*g*] Irenic p. 280.

[*h*] Legimus in Eſaia. Fatuus fatua loquetur. Audio quendam in tantam Erupiſſe vecordiam. Ut Diaconos Presbyteris, id eſt, Epiſcopis anteferret. Nam cum Apoſtolus perſpicue doceat eoſdem eſſe Presbyteros quos Epiſcopos, quid patitur Menſarum & Viduarum Miniſter, ut ſupra eos ſe tumidus efferat.---- Quod autem poſtea unus electus eſt, qui cæteris præponeretur, in ſchiſmatis remedium factum eſt.---- Nam et Alexandriæ a Marco Evangeliſta uſque ad Heraclam &. Dionyſium Epiſcopos, Presbyteri ſemper unum ex ſe Electum in Excelſiori gradu collocatum Epiſcopum nominabant.---- Quid enim facit, excepta Ordinatione, Epiſcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat....

postles Time all one. But it were a palpable Folly to preferr Deacons to Bishops. *Ergo* it is the same Folly to preferr Deacons to Presbyters. The first of these Propositions *viz.* that Bishops and Presbyters were in the Apostles Time all one, He proves from the very same Scriptures which the Presbyterians have ever insisted on. And tho' Episcopacy was so far advanced in his Time, which had been set on Foot after the Apostles Days *for a Remedy of Schism*; yet even then he declares, *That excepting Ordination the Bishop does nothing which the Presbyter might not do.* Is it then Imaginable that after all this, *Jerom* in that very same Epistle should allow Bishops to be Superiour to Presbyters by Divine Right, as the High Priest under the Law was to the ordinary Priests? No. 'Tis plain that the Comparison runs, not between *Aaron* and his Sons under the Law, and Bishops and Presbyters under the Gospel; but between *Aaron* and his Sons as one Part of the Comparison under the Law, and the *Levites* under them as the other. So under the Gospel Bishops and Presbyters make one Part of the Comparison, answering to *Aaron* and His Sons in that wherin they all agree *viz.* the Order of Priesthood, and the other Part under the Gospel is that of *Deacons* answering to the *Levites* under the Law. And this Gloss upon *Jeroms* Words, as the Context necessarly requires, so the learned *Stillingfleet* (*i*) has expresly confirmed. And besides, Dr. *Hammond*, as we have before observed, by denying the middle Order of *Presbyters* in the Apostles Days, has quite destroyed the Argument from the *Jewish* Priesthood. Was not then Mr. *Rhind* very well advised, when he would press *Jerom* into his Service in the very Face of his own Protestation to the Contrary; and that too for confirming *Clement*'s Testimony who never dropt so much as one Syllable in favours of a Bishop above a Presbyter. So much for *Clemens*, and I don't think but the Reader is by this Time convinced, that Mr. *Rhind* could have been at no loss though he had never mentioned Him.

His Third Testimony is from a Letter of the Emperour *Adrian* to *Servianus*, but, supposing it were for his purpose, 'tis so very shamefull a one, that for the Honour of the Episcopal Order it ought to have been buried in Silence. But Dr. *Monro* (*k*) had touch'd

The *Emperour ADRIAN*

upon

[i] Irenic. p. 268. [k] Enquiry into the new Opinions.

upon it, and therefore Mr. *Rhind* thought it neceſſary he ſhould do ſo too. The Words of the Letter inſiſted on by Mr. *Rhind* p. 109 are. *There are Chriſtians who Worſhip* Serapis, *and they are devoted to* Serapis *who call themſelves the* Biſhops *of Chriſt. There no Ruler of the Synagogue*, no Chriſtian Presbyter, *who does not*, &c. From this he inferrs, 'That when *Adrian* was in *Ægypt Anno Chriſt.* 131. 'the Diſtinction of Biſhops and Presbyters was ſo notorious, that 'the Emperour ſuppoſeth it as an undoubted Truth. But the very contrary is evident from the Emperour's Words. And 'tis clear as Light that theſe whom he calls *Biſhops* in the firſt Clauſe are the ſame with thoſe he calls *Presbyters* in the next: A way of Speaking which every Body knows to be according to the conſtant Stile of the Scripture, and conſequently of all ſuch as knew any Thing of the Chriſtian Affairs. I have ſet down † the Emperour's Words as He wrote them, that the Reader may ſee this the more evidently.

His Fourth Teſtimony p. 110. is from *Irènæus Lib.* 3. Cap. 3. *contra Heres.* who ſaies, *We can reckon them, who were appointed Biſhops by the Apoſtles in the Churches, and their Succeſſors to our Day: To whom alſo they committed theſe Churches, delivering to them the ſame Dignity of Power.* 'Tis anſwered.

IRENÆUS

Firſt, Suppoſing *Irènæus* were againſt us, yet his Judgment about Traditions is of no great Weight. For, in that ſame Chapter which Mr. *Rhind* has cited, He aſſerts (*l*) not only the Preeminence of the Church of *Rome*, but the neceſſary Dependence of all other Churches upon Her. And elſewhere (*m*) he aſſerts Chriſt to have been paſt the *Fortieth* and near the *Fiftieth* Year of his Age, when he ſuffered: And that the Elders who were with *John* in *Aſia* teſtifyed, that they had that by Tradition from *John* himſelf, yea that the Goſpel it ſelf Teaches

† Adrianus Aug. Serviano Cos. S. Ægyptum quem mihi laudabas, Serviane Chariſſime, totam didici, levem, pendulam, & ad omnia famæ momenta volitantem. Illi qui Serapin colunt Chriſtiani ſunt, & devoti ſunt Serapi. Qui ſe Chriſti Epiſcopos dicunt. Nemo illic Archiſynagogus Judæorum nemo Samarites, nemo Chriſtianorum Presbyter, non Mathematicus &c.

[l] Ad hanc enim Eccleſiam, propter Potentiorem Principalitatem, neceſſe eſt omnem convenire Ec. cleſiam.

[m] Lib. 2. Cap. 39. 40. A quadrageſimo aut quinquageſimo Anno declinat jam in Ætatem ſeniorem, quam habens Dominus noſter docebat, ſicut Evangelium & omnes Seniores teſtantur, qui in Aſia apud Joannem Diſcipulum Domini convenerunt, idipſum tradiſſe eis Joannem--- Quinquageſimum autem annum nondum attigit, non tamen multum a quinquageſimo Anno abſtitit.

Teaches it, and he is very angry with thoſe who think otherwiſe. When he ſtumbled ſo prodigiouſly in ſo plain a Caſe; *Pray* what Credit is to be given to his Traditions about the Succeſſion of Biſhops, which is generally acknowledged by the Epiſcopalians themſelves to be a moſt perplexed and uncertain Piece of Hiſtory.

Secondly, Does *Irenæus* ſay, as Mr. *Rhind* has Tranſlated him, that the Apoſtles delivered to the Biſhops the ſame Dignity of *Power*? No, his Words (*n*) *Whom alſo* (viz. the Biſhops) *they left their Succeſſors, delivering to them their own Place of Maſterſhip.* That is, the Apoſtles conſtitute them the Supream Officers in the Church, ſo that they were to have none above them any more than the Apoſtles had. But, that they *delivered* either to Biſhop or Presbyter the *ſame Dignity* of Power, *Irenæus* never ſaid. But

Thirdly, There is no need either of Declining *Irenæus*'s Teſtimony, or refining upon his Words. Mr. *Rhind* tells he cou'd *improve* upon his Teſtimony: And I cannot but wiſh he had made all the Improvement of it he could. For that the Apoſtles appointed *Biſhops* in the Churches, every *Presbyterian* owns. But that he appointed *Prelats* or *Dioceſan* Biſhops, no *Epiſcopalian* has yet proved. If they will ſtill go on to expoſe themſelves by inſiſting upon the Word *Biſhop* no Body can help it. Presbyterians muſt take Care they be not impoſed upon by meer Sounds. 'Tis certain that *Irenæus* took *Biſhop* and *Presbyter* for one and the ſame Officer. 'Wherefore, *ſaith* 'he (*o*), it behoves us to hearken to thoſe who are *Presbyters* in the 'Church, to thoſe who, as we have ſhewn, *have their Succeſſion from* 'the *Apoſtles*; who, together with the Succeſſion of the *Epiſcopate*, have 'alſo received the certain Gift of the Truth according to the Pleaſure 'of the Father. Thus *Irenæus*. *And what ſtrange Confuſion*, ſaies Stillingfleet (p), *muſt this raiſe in any one's Mind that ſeeks for a Succeſſion of Epiſcopal Power over Presbyters from the Apoſtles by the Teſtimony of* Irenæus, *when he ſo plainly attributes both the Succeſſion to Presbyters, and the* Epiſcopacy *too which he ſpeaks of.* So much for *Irenæus*.

His

---

[n] Quos et ſucceſſores relinquebant, ſuum ipſorum locum Magiſterij tradentes.

[o] Quapropter eis qui in Eccleſia ſunt Presbyteris obaudire oportet. His qui ſucceſſionem habent ab Apoſtolis, ſicut oſtendimus, qui cum Epiſcopatus Succeſſione, Chariſma veritatis certum, ſecundum placitum Patris acceperunt.

[p] Irenic. p. 307.

His Laſt Teſtimony, p. 110, is from *Tertullian, who,* ſaith He, *began to flouriſh at the ſame Time with* Irenæus, *that is, in the Declenſion of the Second Century, and ſaies* Lib. de Baptiſmo, ‘ The High ‘ Prieſt, who is the Biſhop, has the Right of giving Baptiſm, after ‘ him the Presbyters and Deacons, but not without the Biſhop's Authority. For Anſwer.

TERTULLIAN.

In the *Firſt* Place. I ſhould be Glad to know where Mr. *Rhind* came by this Piece of *Chronology*. 'Tis true *Tertullian* began to flouriſh in the Declenſion of the Second Century, *viz.* after the Year 192: And wrote his Book *de Baptiſmo*, from which Mr. *Rhind* cites about the Year 201 (*q*). But *Irenæus*'s Flouriſhing was well nigh blown off e're that Time: For he died, ſaies Mr. *Dodwell* (*r*) before the Perſecution under *Severus* which began in the Year 202 or 203. 'Tis then ſomething Hard to conceive, how Tertullian *began to flouriſh at the ſame Time with* Irenæus. But paſſing this

In the *Second* Place. I ask What would Mr. *Rhind* inferr from *Tertullian*'s Teſtimony? Is it that there were *three* diſtinct Orders of Eccleſiaſtical Officers, Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons in the Beginning of the *third* Century? Every Presbyterian owns it. Is it that the Biſhops had this Paramount Power of Baptizing, beyond the Presbyters and Deacons, by *Divine Right*? *Tertullian* Himſelf denys it, and that in the very next Words to thoſe cited by Mr. *Rhind*. ‘ It remains, *ſaith He* (*ſ*), for concluding this little Mat- ‘ ter, to adviſe alſo concerning the Obſervation of giving and re- ‘ ceiving Baptiſm. Of *Giving* indeed the High *Prieſt* who is the ‘ Biſhop has the Right, then the *Presbyters* and Deacons; yet not ‘ without the Authority of the Biſhop FOR THE HONOUR ‘ OF THE CHURCH, which being Safe, Peace is Safe. Other- ‘ wiſe EVEN LAY-MEN HAVE THE RIGHT: For what is ‘ equally received, may be equally given. Thus *Tertullian*. Say now

---

[q] Spanheim Hiſt. Eccleſ. p. 719. [r] Differt. 3. in Iren.

[ſ] Supereſt, ad concludendam materiolam, de obſervatione quoque Dandi & accipiendi baptiſmum commonefacere. Dandi quidem habet jus ſummus Sacerdos, qui & Epiſcopus: Dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen ſine Epiſcopi auctoritate, propter Eccleſiæ honorem, quo ſalvo, ſalva pax eſt. Alioqui etiam Laicis jus eſt. Quod enim ex æquo accipitur, ex æquo dari poteſt.

now, Good Reader, if Mr. *Rhind* was not either very *ill* furnished of Testimonies, or very *well* with Assurance, when he insisted on this.

And thus now I have gone through His *Antiquity*, and hope 'tis plain that when he was a entring on it, he might have spared his Harangue wherein he would perswade the Presbyterians to appeal to the Fathers: For I can hardly believe he has gained much by referring to these Judges. And if his own Conscience was satisfied with these Testimonies he has produced, I must needs say it is no Ill-Natured one.

ARTICLE VI.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Argument for* Prelacy *from the Impossibility of its obtaining so Early and Universally if it had not been of* Divine *Institution, is Examined, From* P. 111. *to* P. 119.

THERE can be nothing more Ridiculous than to dispute against the Possibility of a Matter of Fact. If I had seen Mr. *Rhind* some Time at *Edinburgh*; and, within a Short while after, had heard from unexceptionable Witnesses that he was at a Hunder Miles Distance from it, must I believe notwithstanding that he never changed Places; because I am not able to tell *How* or *When* he did it, nor perhaps answer all the Objections one might puzzle me with against either the Physical or Moral Impossibility of his having done so. Because Mr. *Rhind* was educated *Presbyterian*, was a Zealot in that Way, and profited (more Ways than

than one) above many of his Equals; must I therefore deny that he is now Episcopalian, and of the new Cut too; because neither I, nor indeed any Body else, can account for his Change. Has he not heard Mr. *Dodwell* so often affirming, that the Government was changed about the Year CVI; changed too, not only without any Account *of* it, but without any Warrant *for* it contain'd in the Scriptures? Why then will he dispute against the *Possibility* of a Change? But 'twas his *Pleasure*, as it has been of many of his Brethren Writers to do so; and we must attend Him in His *Performance*.

That a Change, of the Government of the Church by a *Parity* of *Pastors*, into a Government by *Prelacy*, had been morally Impossible, he argues I. From the *Piety* and *Zeal* of the *Primitive* Times. II. From the Universal spread of Episcopacy. III. From the Vigilance of the Governours of the Church. IV. From the Unparallel'dness of the Case. V. From the No-Opposition made to the Change, and the Want of any Insinuation that ever the Church was governed according to the *Presbyterian* Model. Of these in Order.

I. He argues p. 111. 112. from the Piety and Zeal of the *Primitive* Times. 'If the Presbyterian had been the Divine Form of 'Government, it could never once have entered into the Thoughts 'of Men who had shared in or been Subject to this Government, 'to attempt or allow its Change. Would these *Primitive* Persons 'who were Bishops in the first Ages, have usurped an Antiscriptural Authority. What could have tempted them to it? Not 'the Love of Riches, they forsook all for the Sake of Christ. 'Not Ambition; for they knew their Promotion rendered them 'the more Obnoxious to the Fury of their Persecutors. Supposing 'they had been acted either by Worldliness or Ambition, yet would 'the Presbyters and Deacons have suffered such an Encroachment 'to be made upon their Divine Right? Or would the People have 'submitted to such an Usurpation? To this Purpose he. For Answer. It cannot be denyed, that the Zeal and Piety of the Primitive Times was much greater than of ours: But why would he impose upon People by a *Chimerical* Representation of these Times, contrary to the Faith of all History? Men still were, and always will be Men; that is, very Corrupt, how Holy soever the Religion

Religion is which they profeſs. And *Church-Men* are Men too; and, even in the Primitive Times, gave many and very Scandalous Examples, and were the greateſt Cauſe of the Corruption of Chriſtians, and ſometimes of their Perſecution too. What a tragical Complaint does *Euſebius* (*t*) make of the Wickedneſs of *Chriſtians* in general, and of *Church-Men* in particular? 'Biſhops, *ſaith He*, 'ruſhed (*like mad Beaſts*) againſt Biſhops. Moſt deteſtable Hy-'pocriſie and Diſſimulation advanced even to the very Height of 'Wickedneſs. We were not touched with any Senſe of the Divine 'Judgment creeping in upon us, uſed no Endeavours to regain 'his Favour; but wickedly thinking that God neither did regard 'nor would viſit our Crimes, we heaped one Wickedneſs upon 'another. And thoſe who ſeemed to be our *Paſtors*, rejecting the 'Rule of Piety, were enflamed with mutual Contentions againſt 'one another; and while they were only taken up with Con-'tentions, Threatnings, Emulation, Mutual Hatred and Enmity, 'and every one eagerly purſued his Ambition in a Tyrannical Manner, *then the Lord covered the Daughter of Zion with a Cloud in His Anger, and remembered not His Footſtool in the Day of His Anger*, but raiſed up the *Dioclefian* Perſecution againſt them. Thus *Euſebius* and a great deal more to this Purpoſe. Fifty Years before that, *Cyprian* (*v*) complain'd of an Univerſal Depravation in the Clergy as well as the Laity. 'That the Prieſts had no De-'votion, the Miniſters *or Deacons* no Fidelity, That there was no 'Charity in Works, no Diſcipline in Manners. And does not *Jerom* * tell us, that 'the Primitive Churches were tainted with 'many groſs Errors whilſt the Apoſtles were alive, and the Blood 'of Chriſt yet warm in Judea? But why do I inſiſt on Human Teſtimony? Does not the Apoſtle *Paul* himſelf make the like Complaint. *Phil.* 3.18. MANY *walk, of whom I told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the Enemies of the Croſs of Chriſt; whoſe God is their Belly, who mind Earthly Things.* And Chap. 2.21. ALL *ſeek their own, not the Things which are Jeſus Chriſt's.* Even in thoſe early

U

[t] Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. VIII. Cap. I.

[v] Non in Sacerdotibus Religio devota, non in Miniſtris fides integra, non in operibus Miſericordia, non in Moribus Diſciplina &c. *Cyprian* De Lapſis.

* Adverſus Luciferian.

early Times, and while the Church was under Perſecution, a *Diotrephes* could aſpire to the *Preeminence* 3 *John* 9. And even the *Peoples* Liberality made ſo conſiderable a Proviſion for the Maintenance of Church-Men, that the Apoſtles found Cauſe, oftner than once, to Caution them againſt Undertaking the Office for *filthy Lucre*'s Sake 1 *Pet.* 5. 2. 1 *Tim.* 3. 3. Where then was the Impoſſibility of a Change even upon the Principles of Ambition and Covetouſneſs? Might not one at Mr. *Rhind*'s rate of Reaſoning prove, that it was not poſſible there ſhould have been any ſuch Officers as *Sub-Deacons?* The Deacons (Good Men) would not be ſo Ambitious as to ſeek to have Underlings. There could be none ſo mean Spirited as to ſubmit to be ſuch. Suppoſe both theſe, the *People* (of whoſe Charity the Deacons were the Truſtees) would not have ſuffered it. Yet *Cyprian* (*x*) makes Mention of them as undiſputed Officers in his Time; though 'tis certain there was no Divine Inſtitution for them, any more than for *Acolyths* and *Exorciſts* whom he alſo ſpeaks of. Again, 'tis certain all Biſhops were Originally equal, how is it poſſible then that ever there could ariſe *Arch-Biſhops* or *Metropolitans*? Would any of the Biſhops have uſurped the Honour? Wou'd their fellow Biſhops have ſubmitted to the Encroachment? Would the People have ſuffered it? Yet, how Impoſſible ſoever it was that they *ſhould* be; Mr. *Rhind* himſelf I hope will not deny that they *were*; yea and that they were brought in ſo early and with ſo little Noiſe that ſome Learned Men have thought they were from the Beginning. We ſee then how Inſufficient Mr. *Rhind*'s firſt Argument is.

II. He argues p. 112. from the Univerſal Spread of Epiſcopacy. Though ſuch a Change might have happened in a Corner; yet, if *Prelacy* had not been of Divine Inſtitution, how could it have obtained Univerſally? Which yet it did: 'For, *ſaith he p.* 117, 'it was fully eſtabliſhed over all the Earth, without any Oppoſi-'tion or Noiſe a Dozen of Years or ſo after the ſealing of the Sacred Canon. 'Tis anſwered. This is a very Inſufficient Argument. 'Epiſcopacy ſpread it ſelf through the whole Earth. Why ſo did *Arrianiſm*. 'The whole World, *ſaies* Jerom (*y*), groaned and

[x] Ep. 24. [y] Ibid. Ubi Supra.

'and wondered to see it self turned *Arrian*. Besides, 'tis false that Prelacy prevailed Universally. Many Instances might be given to the contrary; but not to wander from Home: Though Christianity was planted here in *Scotland* in the Days of the Apostles, and got the Legal Establishment in the Beginning of the *third* Century; yet we had no such Thing as *Prelacy* till near the midle of the fifth that *Palladius* brought it hither from *Rome*; as *Bede*, *Fordun*, *John Major*, *Hector Boathius*, *Buchanan* and *Craig* with others do testifie.

III. He argues from the Vigilance of the Governours of the Church. 'For, *saith he p.* 115. if Errours in Doctrine, which may 'more easily pass without Notice, did not escape their Observation 'and Censure; how can it be supposed that they wou'd not have 'observed and condemned any Incroachments made upon the Con-'stitution of their Society? But who sees not how false this way of argueing is? Whence came all the Usurpations and Corruptions both in Principle and Practice which began to take Place from the earliest Ages of Christianity? Does not every Body know, that at least a great many of them crept in Insensibly; and that the Tares were sown while Men Slept? 'No, *saies Mr.* Rhind *p.* 117. these 'did not obtain till after some Centuries. They were remonstrated 'against by many. They were never allowed by one half of the Church. This, I must needs say, is confident enough talking. I shall give one Instance for Mr. *Rhind* to try his Skill on: It is the giving of the Eucharist to Infants. It obtained *early*. *Cyprian* (*z*) speaks of it, not as a new thing, but as an Ordinary Practice. It obtained *universally*: *Augustin* (*a*) calls it Apostolical Tradition. No Wonder; for it was pretended to be founded on that Text of Scripture *John* 6. 53. *Except ye eat the Flesh* &c, and he is so brisk on that Head, that he affirms 'that none who minds He 'is a Christian of the Catholick Church denys that Exposition or 'doubts of its Truth. It prevailed so *long*, that the Famous *Benigne Bossuet* Bishop of *Meaux* (*b*) brings it down to the *Twelfth* Century;

[z] Serm. de Lapsis. Sect. 29. [a] Vide Ep. 106. Lib. 1. contra Julianum. Lib. 1. De Peccat. merit. & Remissione contra Pelagianum.

[b] Traite de la Communion sous Les Deux Especes. p. 81. &c.

and affirms it to be uſed at this Day in the *Greek* Church. 'Tis plain that the Practice was unaccountable, and the Principle on which it was built falſe. But can Mr. *Rhind* name the Perſon that remonſtrated againſt the Introduceing it? Can he name any Church that refuſed it? Can he tell the Century in which it began? No, nothing of all this is poſſible. Where is now the Vigilance of the Church Governours? If it could not ſecure in one Thing, how ſhall it do in another?

IV. He argues, p. 116, from the Unparallel'dneſs of the Caſe, 'That the like never happened in the Government of any other 'Society, whether of former or latter Times. For Inſtance, the 'Eſtabliſhment of the conſular Dignity upon the Expulſion of their 'Kings by the *Romans*, and the Change of the Republican into a 'Monarchical Form occaſioned a vaſt Expence of Treaſure and Blood. 'And in the Days of our K. *Charles* I the Monarchy was not deſtroyed 'nor the Common-Wealth eſtabliſhed till after a conſiderable Re-'ſiſtance. From all which he inferrs, *that ſuch an inſenſible Change in the Government of the Church ought not to be ſuppoſed.* This reaſoning is built upon Grounds ſo notoriouſly falſe, that it ſcarce deſerves the Name of a poor Piece of Sophiſtry. For it is contrary to all Hiſtory and Experience, which ſhews us there have been great Changes, the Authors and the Beginnings and Oppoſers of which cannot now be known: Tho' no Man can doubt there hath been an Alteration made. For the Body Spiritual and Civil too, is like the Body Natural; in which as there are ſome Diſeaſes which make ſuch a violent and ſudden Aſſault that one may ſay, at what Moment they began; ſo there are other, which grow ſo inſenſibly and by ſuch ſlow Degrees, that none can tell when the Firſt Alteration was made, and by what Accident from a good habit of Body to a Bad. 'Tis true, the inſtanced Changes both in the *Roman* and *Engliſh* Government occaſion'd a vaſt Expence of Blood and Treaſure. But within the Memory of Man the *Portugueze* in the Year 1640 ſhook off the *Caſtilian* Yoke and ſet up the Duke of *Braganza* for their King: And yet, ſo far as I can learn, there was neither a Farthing Treaſure ſpent, nor a Drop of Blood ſpilt in the

the Quarrel. Becauſe the *Proteſtants* cannot (which *Bellarmin* (*c*) challenges them to do) in all Caſes give an Account of the Author of the Change, the Time when it began, the Place where, who oppoſed it and ſo on; muſt we therefore believe that the Church of *Rome* hath made no Change at all as to her Doctrines and Practices which Chriſt and his Apoſtles ſettled? Who can give us the Hiſtory of the *Communion in one Kind*? It grew by Degrees to be a general Cuſtom; but no Body I ſuppoſe can tell where or when it began? Who is able to trace the Beginnings of the lying Oracles among the Pagans? But muſt we therefore aſcribe them to God? According to Mr. *Rhind*'s Way of Reaſoning, the *Traditionary* Law of the *Jews* muſt paſs for true, and that it came from Mount *Sinai* by Word of Mouth, as the *Written* Law did: For none can ſhew its Original, much leſs name the Authors of the ſeverall Traditions, and who oppoſed them, as Dr. *Symon Patrick* late Biſhop of *Ely* has obſerved (*d*), and from whom I have taken the Subſtance of all this Anſwer, that the Epiſcopal Party may ſee how their Reaſonings againſt the Church of *Rome* quite deſtroy their Reaſonings againſt the *Presbyterians*. Nay are indeed the very Reverſe of them. This might be Sufficient to take off his next Argument, yet *ex Superabundanti* I ſhall conſider it particularly. I ſhould, according to the Order of his Book, have inſerted it before; but for a Reaſon which will juſt now appear, I have delayed it till the Laſt.

V. He argues from the No-Oppoſition made to the Change, and the want of any Inſinuation that ever the Church was governed according to the Presbyterian Model. Thus. ‘When Antichriſtian Prelacy is ſuppoſed to be univerſally eſtabliſhed upon the Ruins of *Jure Divino* Presbytry; there is no conſiderable Body of Diſſenters, not one Presbytry, not a ſingle Presbyter or Deacon, nor ſo much as one Contemporary Chriſtian teſtifying againſt the one, or declareing for the other, or *once inſinuating* that ever the Church was governed according to the *Presbyterian* Model. Nor did *any* in the *ſucceeding* Centuries pretend it did obtain, except Aerius’ and

[*c*] Lib 4. Cap. 5. De Notis Eccleſiæ.
[*d*] On Bellarmin’s ſecond Note of the Church.

' and St. Jerom in the Fourth. The one an infamous Heretick; ' witneſs *Epiphanius* Heres. 75. So that his Teſtimony can be of no ' great Advantage to any Cauſe, and *Jerom*'s as little Serviceable on many Accounts. Thus he p. 113, 114. For Anſwer.

Firſt, Does not Mr. *Rhind* know how inſufficient a Negative Argument in this Caſe is? Does he not know how few Monuments we have of theſe Times? Or has he himſelf recovered them? Does he not know how ill furniſhed even *Euſebius* himſelf was with Documents when he wrote his Hiſtory, & what broken Scrapes he went on? 'Tis no Wonder we cannot give a diſtinct Account of the Riſe and firſt Steps of Epiſcopacy: For, from the Death of the Apoſtles *Peter* and *Paul* in the End of *Nero*'s Reign about the Year 68 for the ſpace of 28 Years, that is, till the Year 96; we have either no Hiſtory to give us Light; or what is worſe than none, a parcel of fabulous Legendary Stories. The learned Jeſuit *Petavius* (*e*) ſpeaking of that Period delivers himſelf thus. ' The ' Chriſtian Affairs of this Period ſtand in a faint Light rather through ' Scarcity of Writers than Matter. For it is not Credible, but that ' the Apoſtles and Diſciples of Chriſt in all the World acted Things ' both great & worthy to be known. But they are generally blended ' with Fables and uncertain Narrations. And 'tis very obſervable, and I deſire the Reader to remark it; that, at the very Time wherein by Mr. *Dodwell*'s Account Epiſcopacy was ſet up, that is about the Year CVI or ſomewhat ſooner, the Chriſtians are repreſented as faint and languiſhing in their Profeſſion and enclined to Apoſtatize. The Author of the younger *Pliny*'s Life prefixed to his Epiſtles (*f*) obſerves p. 33. that he wrote his Letter to *Trajan* concerning the Chriſtians betwixt the Moneth of September CIII and Spring Time in the Year CV. Now in that Letter he gives a moſt lamentable Account of the Chriſtians. For, though, as he there relates, Chriſtianity had ſpread it ſelf through Cities, Villages and Country, yet he was of the Mind that a ſtop might be put to it. And as Evidence of this he tells the Emperour that the Temples of

---

[e] Chriſtianæ res illius Temporis haud magna in Luce verſantur, Scriptorum magis Inopia, quam quia mandari quod poſſet Literis extaret nihil. Nam neque parva, neque ſcitu indigna credibile eſt Apoſtolos, ac Chriſti Diſcipulos toto Orbe geſſiſſe. Sed pleraque fabulis & incertis Narrationibus aſperſa ſunt. Petav. Ration. Temp. par. 10, Tom. poſt. Lib. 5. Cap. 5.

(*f*) Edit. Oxon. 1703.

of the Heathen Gods which were formerly almoſt deſolate now began to be frequented, and that Sacrifices, hitherto neglected, were coming from all Hands; and that the Return of the Chriſtians to *Paganiſm* might be yet greater, if they were pardoned for what was paſt (*g*). 2*dly*, Is there any improbability in conceiving, that Teſtimonies given againſt a Government which afterward obtain'd univerſally might be neglected and loſt, perhaps induſtriouſly ſmothered and deſtroyed. 'Tis certain that there were *Paſſages* foiſted into Books, in Favours of Epiſcopacy, as we have already proved in the Caſe of the *Ignatian* Epiſtles, and as is confeſſed, as to the *old* Editions of them, even by the Epiſcopalians themſelves. And theſe that could find in their Heart to foiſt in *Paſſages for* themſelves, would make no Bones of razing out ſuch as might be *againſt* them. 3*dly*, What though we had not the Contemporaries who teſtified againſt the Change, or at leaſt inſinuate that *Parity* of *Paſtors* did at firſt obtain; may not thoſe that lived ſhortly after do as well, eſpecially when it was againſt their Intereſt to give any ſuch Teſtimony? But indeed we need not run to this. The *Fathers* of all Ages (ſo far as their Teſtimony is worth the Regarding) have given as ample Teſtimony in favours of Presbytry as Heart could wiſh; whereof it will not be amiſs to give ſome Inſtances.

Teſtimonies for Presbytry from Antiquity.

THE Epiſtle of *Clemens* to the *Corinthians* is the Earlieſt, and perhaps the pureſt Piece of Antiquity extant. We have already heard *Grotius* obſerving, and *Stillingfleet* juſtifying him in his Obſerve, that it is written on the *Presbyterian* Scheme. And I need not add to what I have already advanced,

CLEMENS ROMANUS. Ann. Chr. 66.

to

[g] Neque enim Civitates tantum, ſed Vicos etiam atque Agros Superſtitionis iſtius contagio pervagata eſt, quæ videtur ſiſti et Corrigi poſſe. Certe ſatis Conſtat, prope jam deſolata templa cæpiſſe celebrari, & ſacra Solennia diu intermiſſa repeti: paſimque venire victimas, quarum adhuc rariſſimus emptor inveniebatur. Ex quo facile eſt opinari, quæ turba Hominum emendari poſſit, ſi ſit Pœnitentiæ Locus. Plin. Lib. 10. Ep. 97.

to ſhew that Father to be on our Side. Only 'tis no unpleaſant Diverſion to behold the Epiſcopal Scuffle about him. By Mr. *Dodwell*'s Calculation there was no Biſhop (in the Epiſcopal Senſe) in the World at the Time of the Writing of that Epiſtle, ſave *James* ſitting Pope at *Jeruſalem:* All were Presbyters. No wonder then that *Clemens* was ſilent of *Biſhops* above *Presbyters.* No, ſaith Dr. *Hammond* (*h*), *Clement*'s Presbyters were all Biſhops, there was no midle Order of Presbyters at that Time. Nay, ſaith Dr. *Burnet* (*i*) now Biſhop of *Sarum*, you are both wrong, *Clemens* makes Mention both of Biſhops and Presbyters. But pray where? For in all that Epiſtle there are but two Orders of Eccleſiaſticks ſpoken of *viz.* Biſhops and Deacons: That's nothing, *Clemens*, ſaith he, by *Deacons* means *Presbyters.* I'm ſure, how ever Decent it may be, yet 'tis pretty Difficult for one to be Witneſs to this Skirmiſh and keep His Gravity.

IGNATIUS Ann. Chr. 116.

Ignatius, who wrote his Epiſtles, as Dr. *Wake* teſtifies (*k*), *An.* 116 is the firſt who diſtinguiſhes betwixt *Biſhop* and *Presbyter.* And he, as I have ſhewn quite deſtroys the Modern Epiſcopacy. And, that the *Ignatian* Presbyters were employed either in Preaching, Baptizing or giving the Euchariſt I have ſhewn to be meer Suppoſition which there is not one Title in the Epiſtles themſelves to ſupport. Dr. *Hammond* (*l*) mocks *Salmaſius* mightily for ſaying, 'that the *Ignatian* Epiſtles were written when Epiſcopacy, 'properly ſo called came into the Church, becauſe in all his *Epiſtles* 'he ſpeaks highly in Honour of *Presbytry* as well as of *Epiſcopacy*, that 'ſo the People, that had been accuſtomed to the *Presbyterian* Govern-'ment, might the more willingly and eaſily receive this NEW 'Government by *Epiſcopacy*, and not be offended at the NOVEL-'TY of it. And yet I have already produced Mr. *Dodwell* ſaying the very ſame thing on the Matter.

Polycarp who wrote his Epiſtle to the *Philippians* immediatly after

---

[h] Vind. of the Differt. Chap. III. Sect. I. [i] Hiſt. of the Rights of Princes p. 6. [k] Ubi Supra II. Edit. p. 50. [l] Ubi Supra Chap. III. Sect. 4.

after *Ignatius*, as Dr. *Wake* (*m*) would have us believe; though he had the faireſt Occaſion for it, yet, as I obſerved before, makes not the leaſt Mention of two Orders of *Paſtors*, but of Prieſts and Deacons only. And Dr. *Hammond* (*n*) Himſelf can find no other Way to ſhift the Force of this, but by turning theſe *Prieſts* or *Presbyters* into *Biſhops*, and is content to drop the *Presbyters* to ſave the *Biſhops*, who yet, without *Presbyters* to back them, can make but a very *Whiggiſh* Figure.

POLYCARP Ann. Chr. 117.

Juſtin Martyr in his *Apology* for the Chriſtians relates that in Every of their Aſſemblies there was one, whom he calls *Preſident*, who Preached, Prayed, conſecrated the Euchariſtical Elements, which by the Deacons were diſtributed to thoſe that were preſent, and ſent to thoſe that were Abſent (*o*). But that this *Preſident*, whereof there was one in each Chriſtian Aſſembly, was under the Juriſdiction of another Superior to himſelf; or that he had any others, except the Deacons, Inferiour to Himſelf; *Juſtin* gives not ſo much as the leaſt hint from the one end of his Works to the other.

JUSTIN MARTYR Ann. Chr. 150.

Irenæus, as we have heard the Learned *Stillingfleet* already confeſſing, Attributes both the Apoſtolick Succeſſion and the Epiſcopate to the *Presbyters*; and moſt expreſly makes them both one Order (*p*). 'It 'is Neceſſary, *ſaith he*, to withdraw from all 'ſuch wicked Presbyters, but to cleave to ſuch who, as we have 'ſaid before, both keep the Doctrine of the Apoſtles, and Sound 'Speech with their *Presbyterial Order*, and alſo ſhew an Inoffenſive 'Converſation to the Information and Correction of the reſt.—— 'Such Presbyters does the Church bring up, concerning whom 'the Prophet alſo ſaies, *I will give thy Princes in Peace and thy Bi-'ſhops in Righteouſneſs.* And concerning whom the Lord ſaid, '*Who is that Faithfull and Wiſe Steward whom the Maſter ſets over His Houſhold.* 'Tis plain then that *Irenæus* makes his Presbyters *Biſhops*, and Biſhops and Presbyters to be one and the ſame *Order*;

IRENÆUS Ann. Chr. 180.

X and

[m] Ubi Supra p. 20. [n] Ubi Supra Chap III. Sect. 2 [o] Apoll. II. Edit. Græc. Lat. Colon. 1686. p. 97. [p] Lib. IV. cap. 44.

'and, by neceſſary Conſequence, Presbyters muſt needs have all the ſame *Powers* with Biſhops; which is the main thing contended for. In a Word, though *Biſhop* and *Presbyter* were diſtinguiſhed in *Irenæus*'s Days, yet in all his Writings he has not given ſo much as the leaſt Hint that that Diſtinction was of *Divine Right*: But on the contrary ſtill inſinuates, that They are one and the ſame Officer in Point of *Order*.

Tertullian, as I have obſerved before, founds the Diſtinction 'twixt Biſhop and Presbyter not upon *Divine Right*, but the *Honour* and *Order* of the Church; and repreſents the Presbyters as *preſideing* in the Eccleſiaſtical Courts for the Exerciſe of Diſcipline.

TERTULLIAN Ann. Chr. 203.

'Judgment is paſſed, *ſaith he* (*q*), with great Weight as by 'thoſe who are perſwaded that God is Eyeing them; and it is 'the greateſt Fore-Token of the Future Judgment, if any one have 'ſo offended, as to be excluded from Communion in Prayer and of 'the Aſſembly and of all Religious Commerce. Certain approved 'Elders *preſide* who have obtain'd that Honour not by Price, but 'by Teſtimony. Thus he.

Clemens Alexandrinus is manifeſtly on our Side. 'Thoſe Offices, 'ſaith he (*r*), are an Imitation of the An-

CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS Ann. Chr. 204.

'gelick Glory, and of that Diſpenſation, 'which, as the Scriptures ſay, *they* wait for, 'who trading in the Steps of the Apoſtles, 'live in the Perfection of Evangelick 'Righteouſneſs; for theſe the Apoſtle Writes, ſhall be taken up into the 'Clouds, and there firſt as *Deacons* attend, and then according to 'the Proceſs, or next Station of Glory, be admitted into the *Preſ-'bytry*; for Glory differs from Glory, till they increaſe to a perfect Man. Which Paſſage, as Sir *Peter King* has moſt Judiciouſly obſerved (*s*), proves, that in the Judgment of this *Father* there were but two Eccleſiaſtical *Orders*: The *Inferior*, that of *Deacons*, who never *ſat* at the Eccleſiaſtical Conventions, but like Servants *ſtood*; as the Saints, when caught up in the Clouds at the laſt Day,

[*q*] Apolog. Cap. 39. [*r*] Stromat. Lib. VI. p. 481. [*s*] Enquiry into the Conſtitution of the Primitive Church p. 72.

Day, shall *stand* and wait on Christ's Judgment Seat. The *Superiour*, that of *Presbyters*, design'd also by the Name of *Bishops*; who, in the Ecclesiastical Consistories, always *sat* on Thrones or Seats; just as the Saints when the Judgment is over shall be relieved from *standing* or waiting, and have their Glory perfected, in being placed on the Celestial *Thrones* of that Sublime *Presbytry*, where they shall be for ever Blessed and Happy. In a Word, as there are but two *Processes* of the Saint's Glorification *viz.* *Standing* before the Judgment Seat, and being *seated* on a Throne of Glory, beyond which there is no higher Dignity: So *Clemens* makes but two *Orders* of Church Officers, *Deacons* to *attend* and serve, and *Presbyters* to *sit* and Judge.

Origen does indeed distinguish 'twixt *Bishops* and *Presbyters*. But no where can I find him founding the Distinction on *Divine* Institution. But I frequently find him making most horrid Representations of the Pomp & Pride and Prodigality of the Bishops even in these Times of Persecution. Thus, upon these Words *The Princes of the Gentiles exercise Dominion, but it shall not be so among you*, He runs out into a most Lamentable Complaint. ORIGEN Ann. Chr. 226.

'Thus, *saith he* (*t*), the Word 'of God teaches us. But we, either not understanding the Will 'of God laid down in the Scripture, or contemning Christ's Re- 'commendation, are such that we seem to exceed the Pride 'even of the wicked Princes of the World: And we not only as Kings 'seek Armies to go before us, but we make our selves terrible and 'most difficult of Access to the Poor; and are such to those who 'apply to us for any Thing, as even Tyrants and the more cruel Prin- 'ces of the World are not towards their Subjects. And we may see 'in some Churches especially of the greatest Cities the Princes (that 'is the *Bishops*) of the Christian People have no Affability, or allow 'Access to themselves. And the Apostle indeed charges even Ma- 'sters concerning their Servants saying, *Masters give unto your Ser- 'vants that which is Just and Equal, knowing that ye also have a Master 'in Heaven.* And he commands them also *to forbear Threatning.* 'But some *Bishops* threaten cruelly, sometimes indeed upon the Oc-

t) In Matth. Tract. XII.

'caſion of Sin, but at other Times out of Contempt of the *Poor*. Thus *Origen*. And all this State which the Biſhops took on was the more Intollerable, that their Title to the *Chiefty* ſeem'd ſomewhat Dubious to him. 'It *ſhall not be ſo among you*, that is, *ſaith he*, Let not 'thoſe who SEEM to have SOME Cheifty in the Church act the 'Lords over their Brethren, nor exerciſe *Power* over them †.

Gregory Thaumaturgus, as Dr. *Burnet* (*v*) from his Life written by *Gregory Nyſſen* relates his Story, 'Being 'much ſet on the Study of *Philoſophy*, was 'affraid of engaging in the *Paſtoral* Charge, 'and therefore avoided all Occaſions in 'which he might have been laid hold on and Ordain'd: Which 'Phedimus a Neighbouring Biſhop obſerving, though *Gregory* was 'then Diſtant three Days Journey from him, he did by *Prayer* De-'dicate him to the Service of God at *Neoceſaria* where there were then 'but Seventeen Chriſtians; to which the other ſubmitted, and came 'and ſerved there. Whether he received any new *Orders*, is but 'dubiouſly and darkly expreſſed by that Author. Thus Dr. *Burnet*. From which two Things appear. *Firſt*, That *Impoſition of Hands* is not abſolutly neceſſary to make a Church Officer as Mr. *Rhind* would have us believe. *Secondly*, That though *Gregory* was a Biſhop, yet it was but of *one* Congregation, and a very ſmall one too at firſt, ſo that he neither had nor needed *Presbyters*.

GREGORIUS THAUMATURGUS Ann. Chr. 233.

Cyprian needs not be inſiſted on. Mr. *Jameſon* † and Mr. *Lauder* * have ſo learnedly and largely proved that the *Cyprianic* Biſhop had neither abſolute Power, nor Plurality of Congregations, nor a Negative Voice, nor, in a Word, contributes any Thing to ſupport the modern Epiſcopacy; that, to add were ſuperfluous: And therefore I muſt referr the Reader to their Labours.

CYPRIAN Ann. Chr. 240.

Baſilius

† Inter vos autem qui eſtis mei, non erunt hæc. Ne forti qui *videntur* habere *aliquem* in Eccleſia *Principatum*, dominentur Fratribus propriis, vel poteſtatem in eos exerceant. *Origen.* Tract. 12 in *Matth.* Lat. *Genebrard.* Pariſiis. 1604.

(*v*) Hiſt. of the Rights of Princes. p. 9. † Cypr. Iſor. * The Ancient Biſhops conſidered.

Basilius Magnus in terms asserts the equal Power of all Pastors and Doctors. 'And this, *saith he* (*x*), we are 'taught by Christ himself when he constituted Peter 'Pastor of his own Church after himself. For he 'saith; *Peter loveſt thou me more than theſe*; *feed my* 'Sheep. And to all Pastors and Doctors that were 'to come after, he gave an *equal* Power. And it is a Sign of this, 'that they all in like manner bind and loose as he did. Thus he.

BASILIUS MAGNUS Ann. Chr. 370.

Aerius is confessed to have been *Presbyterian.* But, saith Mr. *Rhind*, *He was an Infamous Heretick.* Be it so, yet not a greater one than *Tertullian*, whom yet Mr. *Rhind* cited in favours of Episcopacy. For, besides his *Montanism*, some of the Learnedst Doctors in the present *Roman* Church have taken a great deal of Pains, saith Dr. *Symon Patrick* (*y*) to make the World believe that *Tertullian* and a Number of other Ancient Fathers were infected with the Arian Heresy. But who saies that *Aerius* was a Heretick? Mr. *Rhind* answers, 'twas *Epiphanius Heres.* LXXV. But who knows not that *Epiphanius*'s Testimony is of very small Weight? Is it not his known Character that his Learning was above his Judgment, but his Invention above them both? Was there ever a more pitifull Piece written than his Book about *Heresies*? Was there ever any thing weaker than what he has advanced against *Aerius* even upon the Point of *Episcopacy*? Do not the Episcopal Writers (*z*) themselves own, that he has spoken Nonsense on that Head? Must not every Protestant own that *Aerius* was a better Man than himself and more Orthodox in the Faith, when he condemned Prayers for the Dead which *Epiphanius* undertakes to justifie against Him. Is it not known that a great deal more has been said to purge *Aerius* from the Charge of *Arianism* than ever was, or perhaps, can be said for proving him Guilty of it? Mr. *Rhind* then ought to have been a little more modest in his Character of *Aerius*, till he had discoursed the Matter more fully.

AERIUS Ann. Chr. 371.

Ambrose,

[x] Constitut. Monastic. Cap. XXII. [y] On Bellarmin's II. Note of the Church. [z] Dr. Reignolds Letter to Sir Francis Knolls. Bellarmin. Tom. 1. Contra. 5. Lib. 1. cap. 15.

Ambroſe, or the *Hilary* whom I cited before, upon theſe Words Eph. IV. ij. *And he gave ſome Apoſtles*. Gives a plain Account of the Change. 'After, *ſaith he* '(*a*), that Churches were planted in all 'Places, and Offices ordain'd, Matters were ſetled 'otherwiſe than they were in the Beginning.------ And thence it 'is that the Apoſtles Writings do not in all things agree to the 'preſent Conſtitution of the Church becauſe they were written un-'der the firſt Riſe of the Church: For he calls *Timothy*, who 'was created a *Presbyter* by him, a Biſhop: For ſo at firſt the 'Presbyters were called, among whom this was the Courſe of 'Governing Churches, that as one withdrew another took His 'Place, and in *Egypt* even at this Day the Presbyters Ordain in 'the Biſhop's Abſence. But becauſe the following Presbyters be-'gan to be found unworthy to hold the firſt Place; the Method 'was changed, the Council providing that not Order but Merit 'ſhould create a Biſhop. Thus he And *Auguſtin*, as *Stillingfleet* (*b*) obſerves, cites theſe Commentaries with Applauſe, without Stigmatizing him for a Heretick.

AMBROSE Ann. Chr. 376.

Chryſoſtom delivers himſelf with a bundance of Freedom on the Presbyterian Side. 'The Apoſtles, ſaith he (*c*), having 'diſcourſed concerning the *Biſhops* & deſcribed 'them, declaring what they ought to have, & from 'what they ought to abſtain; omitting the Order 'of *Presbyters*, he deſcends to the *Deacons*; and why ſo, but becauſe 'between *Biſhop* & *Presbyter* there is no great Odds; and to them is 'committed both the Inſtruction & the *Preſidency* of the Church: 'And whatever he ſaid of *Biſhops* agrees alſo to *Presbyters*. In *Or-'dination* alone they have *gone beyond*, and in this only they Seem 'to *defraud* † the Presbyters. Thus he. *And*, ſaith *Willet* (*d*) *the*

CHRYSOSTOM Ann. Chr. 398.

---

[a] Tamen poſtquam omnibus locis Eccleſiæ ſunt Conſtitutæ, & Officia ordinata: Aliter compoſita res eſt, quam cæperat.-----Ideo non per omnia conveniunt Scripta Apoſtoli Ordinationi quæ nunc in Eccleſia eſt, quia hæc inter ipſa Primordia ſunt ſcripta. Nam & Timotheum Presbyterum a ſe creatum Epiſcopum vocat, quia primum Presbyteri Epiſcopi appellebantur. Ut recedente uno ſequens ei ſuccederet. Denique apud Ægyptum Presbyteri Conſignant, ſi præſens non ſit Epiſcopus. Sed quia Cæperunt ſequentes Presbyteri Indigni inveniri ad Primatus tenendos; immutata eſt Ratio, proſpiciente Concilio: Ut non ordo, ſed meritum crearet Epiſcopum, multorum Sacerdotum judicio conſtitutum, ne indignus temere uſurparet & eſſet multis ſcandalum. *Ambroſ.* in Eph. 4.

[b] Irenic. p. 313. [c] In Prior Ep. ad Tim. Hom. XI.

† Vide I Theſſ. C. IV. v. 6. in the Greek, and compare it with Chryſoſtom's.

(d) Synops. Papis. Controv. V. Queſt. III. p. 273.

the Distinction of Bishops *and* Presbyters, *as it is now received, cannot be directly proved out of Scripture*: *And of this Judgment Bishop* Jewell *against* Harding *sheweth* Chrysostom *to have been.* So that here we have two Church of *England* Divines owning *Chrysostom* to be on our Side.

Austin in his Epistle to *Jerom* disclaims the *Divine Institution* of Prelacy and founds it upon *Ecclesiastick Use*.

'Although, *saith he* (*e*), according to the Words of Honour, which *Use* has *now* made fashionable in the Church the Episcopate is greater than the Presbyterate: Yet, in many Things is *Augustin* inferiour to *Jerom*. That this Testimony is not strained, I appeal to Bishop *Jewell*'s Declaration. 'In St. *Jerom*'s Time, *saith he* (*f*), there 'were Metropolitans, Archbishops, Archdeacons and others, but 'Christ appointed not these Distinctions of Orders from the Beginning. This is the Thing which we defend. St. *Jerom* saith, *Let* '*Bishops understand that they are in Authority over Priests more by Cu*'*stom than by Order of God's Truth*. And *Augustin* declares, *That* 'the Office of a Bishop *is above the Office of a Priest not by Authority of* 'the Scripture, *but after the Names of Honour which the Custom of the* 'Church *hath now obtain'd*. Thus Bishop *Jewell*.

Theodoret in like manner saith (*g*), 'The Apostles call a *Pre*'*sbyter* a *Bishop*, as we shewed when we exponed the Epistle to the *Philippians*, which may be also learned from this Place, for after the Precepts proper to *Bishops*, he describes the Things that agree to *Deacons*: But, as I said, of Old they called the same Men both *Bishops* and *Presbyters*. Thus *Theodoret*.

AUGUSTIN Ann. Chr. 420

THEODORET Ann. Chr. 430.

'*Primasius*, who is said by some to have been *Augustin*'s Disciple puts the Question *Why the Apostle leaps from the Duties of* Bishops *to the Duties of* Deacons *without any Mention of* Presbyters; and answers

PRIMASIUS Anno Chr. 440.

plainly

[*e*] Quanquam enim secundum Honorum Vocabula, quæ jam Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit, Episcopatus Presbyterio major sit: Tamen in multis Rebus *Augustinus Hieronymo* minor est. *Aug.* Ep. 19.

[*f*] Apolog. Part. II. C. III. Div. 5. [*g*] In prior Ep. ad Tim. C. III.

plainly as before, *That* Biſhops *and* Presbyters *are the ſame Degree* (*h*).

Sedulius our Countryman, in his *Commentaries* on *Tit.* 1. aſſerts the Identity of *Biſhop* and *Presbyter*, that not only the Names are interchangeable, but the Office the ſame; many of them being to be found in one City; which could not be true of *Dioceſan* Biſhops. And for Proof and Inſtance he adduces the Elders of *Epheſus Acts* XX, who dwelling all in one City, though they are called Elders or Presbyters in the 17 *verſe* are yet called Biſhops in the 28 *verſe*. Indeed it was no wonder *Sedulius* was *Presbyterian*: For though he wrote not his *Commentaries* till he went abroad, yet in *Scotland*, where he was born and bred, there was no ſuch thing as a *Biſhop* while he lived in it (*i*); whatever *Spotſwood* hath ſaid to the Contrary.

SEDULIUS Ann. Chr. 470.

The Second *Council* of *Sevil* plainly declares, *That though there are many Functions of the Miniſtry common to the Presbyters with the Biſhops, yet* BY THE MODERN and ECCLESIASTICAL RULES, *there are ſome Functions denyed to them, ſuch as the Ordination of Presbyters* (*k*).

CONCILIUM HISPALENSE. II. Ann. Chr. 619.

That *Council*, we ſee, does not inſiſt upon *Divine Right*, but upon *Eccleſiaſtical Rules*, and owns the Appropriation of Ordination to the *Biſhop* to be a *Modern* Practice.

I might alſo give the Teſtimony of *Theophylact*, who is ſaid by ſome to have flouriſhed about the Year Eight Hunder and Eighty, but placed by *Baronius* in the Year 1071. But his Teſtimony being the ſame with that of *Chryſoſtom* whoſe *Echo Stillingfleet* calls him, I need not repeat his Words.

THEOPHYLACT Ann. Chr. 880.

Oecumenius, ſaid by ſome to have lived in the Eight, by ſome in the Ninth, and by others put off till the Eleventh Century. Upon *Acts* XX. 17, thus delivers himſelf. ‘Many are Ignorant of the Manner ‘eſpecially of the New Teſtament, whereby *Biſhops*

OECUMENIUS Ann. Chr. 900.

---

[h] In I Tim. III. [i] See Dalrymple's Collect. C. IV. V. Sedulij Poem. Prefat Dupin Cent. V. p. 50. [k] Caranz. Summ. Concil. Hiſpal. Can. 7 p. [mihi] 269 Quamvis cum Epiſcopis plurima illis Miniſteriorum communis ſit diſpenſatio, quædam Novellis & Eccleſiaſticis regulis ſibi prohibita noverint, ſicut Presbyterorum Conſecratio.

Biſhops are called *Presbyters*, and Presbyters Biſhops. This may be obſerved both from this Place, and from the Epiſtle to *Titus*, and from the Epiſtle to the *Philippians*, and from the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*. From this Place therefore of the *Acts* we may arrive at the Certainty of this Matter: For thus it is written, *From* Miletus *he ſent and called the Elders of the Church*. It is not ſaid, the *Biſhops*; and yet afterwards he ſubjoins, *Over which the Holy Ghoſt hath made you* Biſhops *to feed or rule the Church*. And from the Epiſtle to *Titus*, *That thou mighteſt appoint Elders in every City*, which *Elders* are afterwards called Biſhops. And from the Epiſtle to the *Philippians*. *To all that are at* Philippi *with the Biſhops and Deacons*. And, as I believe, the ſame may be gathered from the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*. *If any Man deſire the Office of a Biſhop, he deſires a good Work*. Thus *Oecumenius*.

To all theſe we may join the *Canon* Law, in which we find Pope *Urban* pronounceing in theſe Words. *We call the* Diaconate *and the* Presbyterate *the Sacred Orders, for theſe* ALONE *the primitive Church is read to have had* (*l*).

CANON LAW

And now I think I may conclude with *Jerom*'s Teſtimony, who has declared more roundly for *Presbytry*, than *any*, perhaps *all* the *Fathers* together ever did for *Epiſcopacy*. *Jerom*, I ſay, of whom *Eraſmus* witneſſeth, that *He was, without Controverſy, the moſt Learned of all Chriſtians, Prince of Divines, and for Eloquence that he excelled* Cicero. We have heard him already in his famous Epiſtle to *Evagrius*. And Mr, *Rhind* p. 114 ſeems as if he wou'd have his Reader believe that that is the only Place in which he declares for *Presbytry*. But herein he impoſes upon his Reader: For elſewhere *viz.* in his *Commentaries* upon the Epiſtle to *Titus*, he declares yet more explicitly for *Presbytry*, if more can be, than in that famous Epiſtle. Nor does he manage his Buſineſs, as the pretended Patron of Epiſcopacy the falſe *Ignatius* does his, by a Flow of Words and high ranting Expreſſions which muſt needs give Scandal to all the World; but he talks like a Learned Man, reaſons

JEROM Ann. Chr. 385.

[1] Decret. ima pars Diſt. 60. c. 4 *nullus in Epiſ.* Sacros autem ordines dicimus Diaconatum & Presbyteratum, Hos ſiquidem ſolos Primitiva legitur habuiſſe Eccleſia.

the Matter, applies himself to his Reader's Understanding, does not put him off with *Rapture* and *Harangue*, but convinces him by plain downright Argument. I shall give his Testimony at large, & so much the rather, that it contains almost all the *Scripture* Arguments for Presbytry.

'Let us, *saith he (m)*, carefully heed the Words of the Apostle 'saying, *That thou mayest Ordain Elders in every City as I have ap-* 'pointed thee. Who, discoursing in what follows what sort of *Pre-* 'sbyter ought to be Ordained, says this, *If any one be blameless, the* 'Husband of one Wife &c afterwards adds, *For a Bishop must be blame-* 'less as the Steward of God. A *Presbyter* is therefore the *same* with a 'Bishop. And before that, by the Devil's Instinct, there were Par- 'ties in Religion: And it was said among the People, *I am of Paul,* 'I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, the Churches were Governed by the 'Common Council of Presbyters. But after that every one began to 'think that those whom he had Baptized were his own not Christ's: 'It was decreed in the whole World, that *one* chosen from among 'the Presbyters should be set above the Rest, to whom all care of the 'Church should belong, and that the Seeds of Schisms might be 'taken away. If any one think that this is our Judgment, and not 'the Judgment of the Scriptures that a *Bishop* and *Presbyter* are *one*; 'and that the one is a Name of Age, the other of Office: Let him 'read again the Words of the Apostle to the *Philippians* saying, 'Paul and Timotheus the Servants of Jesus Christ, to all the Saints in 'Christ Jesus that are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons, Grace 'to you and Peace and so on. *Philippi* is *one* City of *Macedonia*; and 'surely in *one* City there could not be a Plurality of such as are 'called *Bishops*. But because at that Time they called the *same* 'Persons *Bishops* and *Presbyters*: Therefore he spake indifferently 'of Bishops as of *Presbyters*. This may yet seem doubtfull 'to some, unless it be proven by another Testimony. In the *Acts* 'of the Apostles it is written, that *when the Apostle had come to Mile-* 'tus, he sent to Ephesus and called the Presbyters of that same Church, 'to whom afterward among other Things he said: *Take heed to your* 'selves and to all the Flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you 'Bishops, to feed the Church of the Lord, which he hath purchased with

(m,) Comment. in Tit.

'*with his own Blood.* And here obſerve carefully, how calling 'the Presbyters of the *one* City of *Epheſus*, he afterwards calls the '*ſame* Perſons *Biſhops*. If any will receive that Epiſtle, which is written 'to the *Hebrews* under the Name of *Paul*: There alſo the Care of the 'Church is equally divided among many: For he writes to the People, '*Obey them that have the Rule over you, and ſubmit your ſelves, for they 'watch for your Souls as thoſe that muſt give an Account, that they may 'not do it with Grief, for this is unprofitable for you.* And *Peter* 'who received his Name from the Strength of his Faith, ſpea-'keth in his Epiſtle ſaying, *The Presbyters who are among you I exhort, 'who am alſo a Presbyter, and a Witneſs of the Sufferings of Chriſt and a 'Partaker of the Glory that ſhall be revealed, feed the Flock of the Lord 'which is among you, not as of Neceſſity but willingly.* We have alledg-'ed theſe Things, that we might ſhew that among the An-'cients the *Presbyters* were the *ſame* with the *Biſhops*: But that *by 'little and little* the Roots of Diſſention might be plucked up, the whole Care was devolved upon *one*. As therefore the Presbyters 'know that *by the Cuſtom of the Church* they are Subject to him 'who is ſet over them: So let the Biſhops know that they are 'greater than the Presbyters rather *by Cuſtom, than the Truth of 'the Lord's Diſpoſition or Ordering*, and that they ought to govern 'the Church *in Common*, imitating *Moſes*, who when he had it in 'his Power *alone* to govern the People of *Iſrael*, choſe Seventy with 'whom he might Judge the People. Thus *Jerom*. And I know not how any *Scots* Presbyterian could have written more patly in Favours of Presbytry. Yet Mr. *Rhind* has many Things to *except* againſt *Jerom*'s Teſtimony: Whom therefore I reſerved to the Laſt, putting him out of the due Order of Time, that I might conſider theſe *Exceptions* without interrupting the Liſt.

I. He excepts p. 114. 'That *Jerom* lived too late to Teſtifie 'concerning Matters of Fact that happened about the Beginning 'of the *Second* Century. Now *Jerom* was born *Anno Chr.* 329. Did he live too late to Teſtifie of what happened within leſs than 200 Years before his Birth? If ſo, the Teſtimony of moſt Part of the *Fathers*, nay indeed of almoſt all Hiſtorians will be of very little worth. Do we at this preſent live too late to Teſtifie concerning the Form of Government which obtained in *Scotland* about the Year 1520, when almoſt every Plowman can tell it was *Popery*?

II. He excepts, that *Jerom* is but *Teſtis Singularis*. *Ibid.* 'Tis true,

if a score or moe be the same Thing with one, then *Jerom* is *Testis Singularis*. But when we have found so many of the Fathers concurring with him, I need not tell how false that Exception is.

III. He excepts, *Ibid.* 'That *Jerom* destroys the Credit of his 'own Testimony, by contradicting himself in this very Point. In '*Epist. ad Heliodor.* and *Nepotian* & in *Comment* in *Ps.* 45. *vers.* 16. The very Truth is, there are few of the *Fathers* who do not in some Points contradict themselves as well as one another. But, for these Places which Mr. *Rhind* has cited; they signifie nothing, unless he had pointed to the particular Words of 'em wherein he thinks *Jerom* has contradicted himself. For Instance, in the *Epist.* to *Helidor.* he makes the Presbyters to succeed to the Apostles, and to have the Power of Excommunication &c (*n*). I apprehend this is no Argument either for *Episcopacy*, or that he has contradicted himself. And that he has neither there, nor indeed any where else contradicted himself in this point; *Stillingfleet* is a pretty competent Witness. '*Among all the fifteen* Testimonies, *saith he* (*o*), produced by a 'learned Writer out of *Jerom* for the Superiority of Bishops above 'Presbyters, I cannot find one that does found it upon *Divine Right*; 'but only on the Convenience of such an Order, for the Peace and 'Unity of the Church of God.'

IV. He excepts, *Ibid. That it reproacheth the Wisdom of our Lord and his Apostles to suppose that they did establish a Form of Government necessarly productive of Schisms*: This is to his old Tune of prescribeing to Christ and the Apostles. The Government which they established, which, I hope, we have proven to have been *Presbyterian*, did not *necessarly*, that is, in the Nature of the Thing, produce Schisms; but by Accident only. Our Saviour foresaw that Schisms would arise even under the Government of Divine Institution. *Suppose ye that I am come to give Peace on Earth, I tell you nay, but rather Division.* Luke XII. 51. And the Apostles not only foresaw but felt it. *I hear that there be Divisions among you.* 1 Cor. XI. 18. And yet they would not prevent them by setting up a Government that should

[n] Absit ut de his quicquam sinistrum loquar, qui Apostolico gradui Succedentes Christi Corpus sacro ore conficiunt.---- Mihi ante Presbyterum sedere, non licet: Illi, si peccavero, licet tradere me Satanæ.

[o] *Irenic.* p. 277.

ſhould be utterly incapable of them. No. God had infinitely wiſe Ends to ſerve by not doing it. *I hear that there be Diviſions* (Schiſms) *among you, and I partly believe it. For there muſt be alſo Hereſies* (Sects) *among you that they which are approved, may be made manifeſt among you.* 1 Cor. XI. 18. 19.

V. He excepts p. 115, 'that it is too ſevere a Charge to be offered againſt the Catholick Church, that it would endeavour to heal theſe Breaches by a Device of its own Invention, that is, '*Do Evil that Good might come of it.* I anſwer. 'Tis confeſſed, the Charge is Severe; but that which makes it ſo is, that it is perfectly true; and not in that only, but in a Thouſand other Caſes; as is evident from the innumerable Corruptions, which, by Degrees, did overſpread the whole Church. And *Whitaker* (Their own *Whitaker*) diſcourſing of *Jerom*'s foreſaid Teſtimonies very frankly tells 'that the Remedy was almoſt worſe than the Diſeaſe. 'For as firſt one *Presbyter* was ſet over the reſt, and made Biſhop; ſo afterwards one Biſhop was ſet over the reſt. And ſo 'that Cuſtom begot the Pope with his Monarchy, and by little 'and little brought them into the Church. Thus he (*p*). And 'tis certain that Schiſms were never ſo frequent as after *Epiſcopacy* prevailed; and *Biſhops* themſelves were generally either the Authors, Occaſion or Fomenters of them. And Ancient Hiſtories ſupply us with ſuch dreadfull Accounts of ſuch Murder, Blood ſhed and Horrid Barbarities, committed by the contending Parties at the Election of Biſhops, as are not to be parallelled among the Heathens. So much in Vindication of *Jerom*, who, I hope, is ſtill ſafe to us after all Mr. *Rhina*'s Exceptions.

And now to conclude this Argument: It was ſo far from being morally impoſſible that *Prelacy* ſhould obtain, even in ſpite of the *Divine* Inſtitution of *Presbytry*; that, conſidering the Corruption of Human Nature, it had been next to a Miracle if it had not obtained. For is there any Thing to which Man is more violently addicted than the thwarting God's Inſtitutions? Did not this Humour

[p] Sed ipſo morbo deterius pene Remedium fuit; nam ut primo unus Presbyter reliquis prælatus eſt, & factus Epiſcopus: Ita poſtea unus Epiſcopus reliquis eſt Prælatus. Sic iſta Conſuetudo Papam cum ſua Monarchia peperat, & Paulatim in Eccleſiam invexit. *De Regim. Eccleſ.* p. 540.

Humour begin to work even in the *Paradisiacal* State? What a fine Speech could Mr. *Rhind* make to disprove the *Israelits* making the Golden Calf at *Horeb*! 'No. 'Twas morally impossible they 'should. God had delivered them out of *Egypt* with a mighty 'hand, and in a wonderfull Manner: He had dryed up the Red 'Sea before 'em, and drown'd their Enemies in it: He had given 'them the Law with all the Solemnities of Majesty and Circum-'stances of Terrour; Therein he had expresly inhibited 'em to 'make unto themselves any graven Image: They had in the most 'Solemn Manner Stipulate Obedience. Would they now after all 'this, within forty Days too, so impiously oppose God, so perfidi-'ously violate their own Engagements as to contraveen that Law? 'No. The *Men* of 'em surely were Masters of more Reason: The '*Women* and *Children* were more fond of their Jewels and Ear-'Rings, than to part with them to be melted down into an Idol: 'All of 'em had either a warmer Sense of God's late Mercies, or 'a more terrible Impression of his Majesty and Justice from the 'late Appearance he had made on Mount *Sinai*, than to venture 'on such a Prank. Suppose they had been all willing, yet, would 'ever *Aaron* have complyed with the Motion? No. It must needs 'be all Legend and Fable. And, which confirms this; *Josephus*, 'who has given us so Judicious and accurate a History of the *Jews*, 'is utterly Silent of it. And yet, how impossible soever it was, there is notwithstanding a certain Book which common Folks call the *Bible*, and Christians believe to be the *Divine Oracles* that assures us that the *People* urged it *Aaron* did it, and the molten Calf was set up and consecrate with great Triumph and without Contradiction. *These be thy Gods O Israel which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt*: And without any further *Act for Conformity* the People got up early next Morning, and offered up their *Oxen* to the *Calf*, the God and the Sacrifice being out of the same Herd. So easie a Thing is it to make a Change in Religion to the worse, yea and to bring about an *universal* Compliance with the Change. *Vain Man would be wise, though He be born like a wild Ass's Colt.* There is Nothing Men in all Ages have been more bewitched with than an itch of Refineing upon God's Appointments. And a Conceit that they were able to better them, and that execrable Principle

Principle, *That they had Power to do so*, have been the Original of all the Corruptions that have ever defiled or peſter'd the Church. 'Tis Plain that all the Fopperies and Ceremonies that have crept into the Worſhip of God owe their Birth to this. And 'tis no leſs plain from *Jerom*'s former Account, that *Prelacy* was hewn out of the ſame Quarry. Some aſpireing Men have coloured their Ambition with the Pretext of remeeding Schiſms; and the reſt, either through want of Thought or Courage, have been gull'd into a Compliance, or blinded poſſibly with the hopes, that the Dignity might on Day fall to their own Share. But enough of this.

SECT. VI.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Reaſonings againſt the* Presbyterian *Ruling-Elders and Deacons, are Examined. From* P. 102 *to* P. 107.

THE Main Part of the Controverſy viz. *Whether the Order of Biſhops as Superiour to Presbyters be of Divine Apoſtolical Inſtitution*, being thus diſcuſſed; we are next to conſider what Mr. *Rhind* has advanced againſt the *Presbyterian* Ruling-Elders and Deacons. And *firſt* againſt the Ruling Elders.

ART.

ARTICLE I.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Reaſonings againſt the Presbyterian* Ruling-Elders, *are Examined.*

I. HE Objects that the *Presbyterian* Ruling-Elder is an Officer of *Calvin*'s Inſtitution p. 102. But here His Hiſtory has failed him: For the Churches of *Bohemia* had ſuch Officers before ever *Calvin* ſet up the Diſcipline of *Geneva.* And *Martin Bucer* Divinity Profeſſor in *Cambridge* approved and commended the *Bohemian* Practice; and juſtified it both from the Scripture and from the Writeings of the Fathers. This was long ſince ſuggeſted by the *Presbyterian* Authors (*q*): And I do not find that ever any Anſwer was returned to it; But there is no other way of furniſhing out of the *Epiſcopal* Books, but by repeating the ſame baffled Arguments over and over again. 'Tis plain then, how Modern ſoever the Order of *Ruling-Elders* may be, yet it is not of *Calvin*'s Inſtitution.

II. He objects, ibid. '*that ſuch an Officer was never heard of in* '*the Church, till* 1500 *Years after the ſealing of the Canon of the Scripture.* But here he is out again in Point of Hiſtory, yea and contradicts his former Argument: For, by the common Account, the Canon of the Scripture was not ſealed before the Year of Chriſt 96. The Diſcipline and *Ruling-Elders* were eſtabliſhed at *Geneva* in the Year 1642. So that he is wrong in His Account by more than 50 Years, even keeping within the Bounds of the *Reformation* by *Calvin.*

III. He

[*q*] Alt. Damaſc. p. 695.

III. He objects, *ibid. that there is not a Title concerning them in the Bible.* This is not arguing, but Impudence. We have an Account of them *Rom.* XII. 8. in these Words, *He that ruleth, with Diligence.* And 1 *Cor.* XII. 28. we have them mentioned under the Title of *Governments.* And 1 Tim. V. 17. *Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double Honour, especially they who labour in the Word and Doctrine.* 'By which Words, *saith Dr. Whitaker* 'in his *Prelections*, the Apostle manifestly distinguisheth betwixt 'the Bishops and Inspectors of the Church. If all that rule well 'are worthy of double Honour, *especially* they who labour in the 'Word and Doctrine, it is clear there were some who did not la-'bour: For if they had all done so, the Text had been Nonsense. 'But the Word *especially* makes the Difference. If I should say, 'that all these who study at the University are worthy of double 'Honour, *especially* they who labour in the Study of Theology; I 'behoved either to mean, that all do not apply themselves to the 'Study of Theology, or I should speak Nonsense. Wherefore I 'confess that to be the most genuine Sense of the Text by which 'the Pastors and Doctors are distinguished from those who only 'governed *Rom.* XII. 8. And concerning whom we read in *Am-'brose* on 1 Tim. V. Thus that great Light and Patron of the Church of *England* (*r*). But what saies Mr. *Rhind* to it? Not one Syllable. He owns the Presbyterians found upon Texts of Scripture, but is so wise as not to name them, far less to essay to wring them from the *Presbyterian* Sense. And indeed his Conduct in this is wiser than any where else in his Book: For, it would touch any Man of Bowels with Commiseration to see into what various Forms the *Episcopal* Writers twist themselves to avoid the Force of the Text last cited. It has but *fourteen* Words in the Original even *Particles* included; and they have put at least *fourteen* Senses on it. *Didoclavius* discussed *ten* of them in his Days, and they have been ever since inventing new ones: And had Mr. *Rhind* told us which of 'em he pitched on, I don't believe it would be any hard Matter to

[r] Apud Didoclav. p. 681. Ex Sheervodio.

diſcuſs that too, unleſs it be one of his own which the World never yet heard of; for indeed the Senſe of the Text is ſo very obvious, that none can miſs it who does not induſtriouſly reſolve to torture it. He ſaw very well that he could have made but a ſcurvy Figure, had he tryed his Critical Talent on it; and therefore he had recourſe to the Popular Art of Declaiming againſt the *Ignorance* or *Diſingenuity* of the *Presbyterians*: And every Body muſt own that this was both more eaſie and innocent, than if he had fallen to the wreſting of Scripture, which would have both expoſed his Weakneſs, and made him Liable to Damnation. And yet he is unlucky even in that ſame Popular Art, the Epiſcopal Writers themſelves having proclaimed it *Ignorance* to take the ſaid Text in any other than the *Presbyterian* Senſe. 'Art thou ſo Ignorant, *ſaith* 'the *forecited* Whitaker (s) *to* Dury *the* Scots *Jeſuit*, that thou 'knoweſt not that there are *Elders* in the Church of Chriſt whoſe 'Work it is to govern *only*, not to preach the Word or diſpenſe 'the Sacraments.

IV. He Objects p. 103, *that this*, viz. the buſineſs of the *Ruling-Elders*, *ſeems to be the weak Side of the* Party, *their more Learned Advocates having abandon'd its Defence.* Who are theſe pray? Nay, we muſt wait for a *Second* Edition of his Book e're we know that. 'Twas his Buſineſs to *aſſert* not to *prove*. For my own part I neither know, nor can hear of any *Presbyterian*, Learned or Unlearned, that has abandon'd its Defence. 'Tis true Mr. *Jameſon* of late has ſaid (*t*), that the *Ruling-Elders* are not in a *ſtrict Senſe* Church Officers, and retracts any Thing he had ſaid before to the contrary. And him indeed I acknowledge to be a very Learned Man. But has he therefore abandon'd the Defence of the *Ruling-Elders*? No. He owns they are the Repreſentatives of the *Sacra Plebs*, He has proved by very many Authorities, *Epiſcopal* too among the reſt that ſuch ought to be in the Churh. Nay, the very Argument of his Chapter is *The Divine Right of* Ruling Elders *ſuſtained*. Where then is that Advocate for Presbytry that has abandon'd its Defence? If any has,

[s] Ita ignarus es, ut eſſe in Chriſti Eccleſia Presbyteros neſcias qui gubernationi tantum, non verbi aut Sacramentorum Adminiſtrationi operam darent.

[t] Cypr. Hor. p. 540.

has, we are not likely to be altogether losers, the Advocates for *Prelacy* having taken it up. Not to name again the Learned *Whitaker*, Dr. *Whitby* on the forecited Text has delivered himself according to our Hearts wish. 'The Elders, *saith he*, among the 'Jews were of two Sorts. 1*st*, Such as *governed* in the Synagogue. 'And 2*dly*, Such as *ministred* in reading and expounding their 'Scriptures and Traditions, and from them pronounceing what 'did Bind or Loose, or what was forbidden, and what was lawfull to be done------And these the Apostle here declares to be 'the most honourable, and worthy of the chiefest Reward: Ac'cordingly, the Apostle reckoning up the Offices God had ap'pointed in the Church, places *Teachers* before *Governments* 1 'Cor. XII.

V. He Objects, p. 104, *That all the Ecclesiasticks in the Apostolical Age were initiated into their respective Offices by the Imposition of Hands; whereas Ruling-Elders are admitted by no such Ceremony; or if there be any Solemnity used at all in their Designation to the Office, it is performed by every Parish Minister in his private Congregatiton; which is contrary to* Presbyterian *Principles; and is to exercise the sole Power of Ordination, which is not so much as pretended to by Bishops.* 'Tis Answered 1*st*, The want of the Imposition of Hands will not argue them to be no Church Officers. Not to mention the *Apostles* and *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, of whom before; *Ignatius* himself (if all Traditions are true) was not ordain'd by Imposition of Hands (*v*). No Body doubts it is very lawfull; and for my own Part I heartily wish it were practised; but I deny that it is absolutly necessary, there being no Precept enjoining it, and the Gift of the Holy Ghost in his extraordinary *Charismata* which accompanied the Imposition of the Apostles Hands being now ceased. And of this Judgment are not only *Presbyterians*, but even the most learned Men of the Church of *Rome* her self, though otherwise so much addicted to Ceremonies. Of this, to omit other Testimonies, that Judicious Historian Father *Paul* informs us (*x*). '*Melchior Cornelius* a *Portugal*, *saith He*, seem'ed to speak much to the Purpose, who said, the Apostles did un-

 doubtedly

[v] Dr. Wake's Genuine Ep. 2d. Edit. p. 44.
[x] Hist. Council of *Trent*. p. 555.

'doubtedly uſe Impoſition of Hands in Ordination, ſo that none 'is mentioned in the Holy Scripture without that Ceremony; which, 'in ſucceeding Ages was thought to be ſo eſſential, that Ordination 'was called by that Name. Notwithſtanding *Gregory* the Ninth 'ſaith, It was a Rite brought in, and many Divines do not hold 'it to be neceſſary, howſoever others be of the contrary Opinion. 'And the famous Canoniſts, *Hoſtienſis*, *Joannes Andreas*, *Abbas* and 'others do affirm, that the Pope may Ordain a Prieſt with theſe 'Words only, *Be thou a Prieſt*, and which is of more Importance, '*Innocentius* Father of the Canoniſts ſaith: That if the Forms had 'not been invented, it had been ſufficient if the Ordainer had uſed 'theſe Words only; or others Equivalent, becauſe they were inſti-'tuted by the Church afterwards to be obſerved. 2*dly*, That Bi-ſhops do not pretend to the *Sole* Power of Ordination is ſhameleſsly falſe. We have given Teſtimony before p. 65 that they not only *pretend* to it, but *practiſe* it. And after that Heap of Proofs which Mr. *Jameſon* has brought in his *Cyprianus Iſotimus* for that Purpoſe, a Man muſt be even ſteel'd in the Forehead that denies it. And even when the *Presbyters* are admitted to join with the Biſhop in Acts of Ordination, it is meerly as Witneſſes or Conſenters, not as having the leaſt Share of Power. This, Mr. *Drury* has moſt roundly aſſerted in the *Vindication* of his *Anſwer* to Mr. *Boyſe*'s Sermon concerning the *Scriptural Biſhop*; and, as I am imformed is dignified with the Title of DOCTOR for his Pains. 'All, *ſaith he*, that 'the Presbyters had to do was only to give their Conſent, and to 'let the Church know that ſo Sacred an Action was not done raſhly, 'nor out of Favour and Affection. That they had no Divine 'Right to concur with the Biſhop, that the Power of Ordination was 'in the Biſhop *alone*, the Presbyters were *only* allowed to perform 'a ſhare in the outward Ceremony. 3*dly*, That the Solemnity uſed in the Deſignation of the Ruling Elders to their Office is contrary to *Presbyterian* Principles, Mr. *Rhind* ought to have *proved* not meerly *aſſerted*: For by doing ſo he has mightily expoſed himſelf. 'Tis true it is performed by every Pariſh Miniſter in his private Congregation, he alone enjoins them their Duty, takes their Engagements, and by ſolemn Prayer ſets them apart for the Office. And, as this is their conſtant Practice, ſo they have ſtill own'd it to be their Prin-

ciple

ciple, that it is lawfull to do so. But then the Tryal is made by the Minister and *Eldership* of the Congregation; or, in want of these, by the *Presbytry*; and the *whole People* are by a publick Edict allowed, nay required to represent their Objections against their Admission, if any they have. This is to treat the People like rational Creatures: Whereas, the Bishop's putting men into *Deacon*'s or *Priest*'s Orders privatly in his own Chamber, which was the constant Practice in the late *Episcopal* Times, not only choaks Reason, makes Beasts of the People; but is contrary to the whole Stream of Antiquity, 'The 'People themselves, *as it is in* Cyprian (*y*), having especially the 'Power of chusing worthy Priests, or of rejecting such as are un-'worthy.

VI. He Objects p. 105, that the Scriptural Presbyters were to continue *ad Vitam aut Culpam.* I answer, so are the *Presbyterian* Elders. For once an *Elder* still an *Elder*, unless he is deposed for Malversation. If in some great Towns they are relieved in Course by others, or Honourably dismissed upon their Desire, when Age disables them for Service, this is only such an Allowance as was made to the *Levites* under the Law; and therefore is not inconsistent with the Character of a *Church Officer:*

VII. He objects, *Ibid.* 'That the *Scriptural* Presbyters were al-'lowed their proper Maintenance, whereas the *Presbyterian* Elders 'plead no Title to any such Thing, but are rather losers by the Inter-'ruption of their Trades. The Answer is plain. The same Scripture which founds their Office, entitles them to Maintenance. For the *double Honour* certainly imports no less. But that they do not plead it, is, because the Government has setled no Fund for that Purpose, and that in the present Circumstances they know it would be in vain to plead it. But will that make them no *Church Officers*? Was *Paul* no Church Officer, because he *made the Gospel of Christ without Charge* 1 Cor. IX. 18? Are not the Episcopal *Deacons* Church Officers? They are not now provided in any Maintenance, whereas in the Primitive Church, they were, as *Jerom* witnesseth, better seen to than the *Presbyters* themselves (*z*). 'Tis true the Presbyterian *Elders*

[y] Plebs ipsa maxime habet potestatem vel Eligendi dignos Sacerdotes vel indignos recusandi. *Ep.* 67.
[z] Aut si ex Diacono ordinatur Presbyter, noverit se Lucris minorem, Sacerdotio esse majorem. *Ep.* ad

Elders are sometimes avocate from their Employments by their Office: But this only speaks forth their Generous Temper, in that they prefer the publick Service of the Church to their private Intereſt. Nor are they likely to be loſers thereby: For, *God will not be unmindfull, nor forget their Work and Labour of Love.*

VIII. He argues, *Ibid.* 'Were there any Foundation for ſuch 'an Office in the Holy Scriptures, whence was it that *Ruling-El-* 'ders did ſo early, ſo univerſally and ſo tamely give up their Di- 'vine Right, that there is no once Mention made of any ſuch by Di- 'vine Right in the *Homilies* and *Commentaries* of the Fathers. For Anſwer, I ſhall read to Mr. *Rhind* a *Homily* from the Commentaries of one of the *Fathers*. 'Age, *ſaith the forecited Ambroſe or Hi-* 'lary (*a*), is honourable among all Nations, whence firſt the Syna- 'gogue and afterwards the Church had *Elders*, without whoſe 'Councel nothing was done in the Church. Which by what ne- 'gligence it is fall'n into Diſuetude, I know not, if it be not through 'the Sloath or rather Pride of the Doctors, whilſt they 'alone will ſeem to be ſomething. Thus he. I think it is tolerably clear from this Teſtimony that there were ſuch *Elders* in the Church at firſt: For it is not poſſible *Hilary* could underſtand either *Biſhops* or *preaching Presbyters* by them, ſeeing theſe ſtill continued in the Church. And I think it is as clear, that their being diſuſed was owing to the *Prelatick* Spirit of Ambition, which has been the Mother of ſo many Miſchiefs to the Church. 'Tis therefore no wonder that we don't find the Names of the *Ruling-Elders* in the *Acts* of the General or Provincial *Councils*, when the *Doctors* were of ſuch an uſurping Temper. And perhaps that is the Reaſon why there are ſo very few *Councils* that had a good Iſſue, or of whom we have a comfortable Account. Even the Fathers of the firſt Council of *Nice* were in Peril of throwing their Bibles at one anothers Heads, had not *Conſtantine* wiſely moderated their Choller, and charitably burned their ſcandalous Libels againſt one another. Mr. *Rhind* indeed p. 218 taxes the Presbyterians that *they dubbed here a Godly Webſter, there a Sanctified*

[a] Nam apud omnes utique Gentes honorabilis eſt Senectus, unde & Synagoga & poſtea Eccleſia Seniores habuit, quorum ſine Conſilio nihil agebatur in Eccleſia. Quod, qua negligentia abſoleverit, neſcio, niſi forte Doctorum deſidia aut magis ſuperbia, dum ſoli volunt aliquid videri *Comment.* in 1 *Tim.* 5. 1.

Sanctified Cobler Ruling Elders. But I cannot see why either the *Webster* or the *Cobler* might not be as usefull Members in a Council as *many* of the Bishops. For, we have uncontested Evidences (*b*) that many of them could not read or write their own Name. Mr. *Rhind* ought to have been aware how he inferred that the *Ruling-Elders* are no Church Officers, because they were not present at *Councils*, nor their Names recorded in the *Acts* of them: For, if that Argument be good, it will prove that even the Episcopal *Presbyters* are not Church Officers; *Bellarmin* having shewn (*c*) at great length, that Prelates alone have Power to Sit and Vote in *Councils*. However, this is enough for the *Presbyterian* Practice, that in the *first* and *best* Council that ever was, I mean that at *Jerusalem Acts* XV. both the *Apostles* and *Elders*, yea and the *whole Church v.* 22. were Members; and the *Acts* and *Decrees* thereof passed, not only by their Advice, but with their Suffrage.

Thus now we have seen that the *Ruling-Elders* are of *Divine* Institution, that they obtained in the Primitive Church, that they fell into Desuetude through the Pride of the Bishops; and that in the best constituted Churches in the World, they were revived again upon the first Dawning of the Reformation.

And indeed the Wisdom of our Lord and his care of his Church is very much seen in the Institution. For, as he has appointed *Ministers*, that the *Faith* of the Church may be kept sound; and *Deacons* that the *wants* of her poor Members might be supplied: So he has appointed *Ruling-Elders* to oversee the *Manners* and outward Conversation of Christians, that they be such as become the Gospel. Besides, by this Constitution the Discipline is the more willingly submitted to by the People, being exerced by Persons chosen from among themselves, appointed to represent them, to take care of their Interest, and that they may have no Reason to complain of the Rigour or Severity of the Ministers. To illustrate this a little from the Con-

(b) Helius Episcopus Hadrianopolitanus definiens subscripsi per Romanum Episcopum Myronum, *eo quod nesciam Literas.* Cajumus Episcopus Phœnicensis definiens subscripsi per Coepiscopum meum Dionysium, propterea *quod Literas ignorem. Concil. Ephes.* 2. in *Act.* 1. *Chalced. Conc.* in *Crab.* Tom. I. p. 830. *Conc. Ephes.* I. Patricius Presbyter de vico Paradioxilo, manu utens Maximi Compresbyteri, ob hoc, *quod Literas ignorarem.* Zenon Chorepiscopus----- manum accomodavi pro eo ego Flavius Palladius, ob hoc quod presens dixerit *Literas se ignorare.* in *Act.* 1. *Con.* Chalced. in Crab. p. 816. vide plura apud *Clarkson.* Disc. concerning Liturgies p. 196. [c] De Concil. Lib. 2. Cap. 15.

Conſtitution of the Civil Government. Princes ordinarly live in State, ſee Nothing but Coaches and Six, fine Rooms and full Tables; nor does any Body appear before 'em but in his Sunday's Cloaths. All this is very neceſſary and reaſonable; yet it leaves Them very much unacquainted with the Condition of the Country; nor can They have other than a very faint Senſe of the Preſſures and Calamities Their People may be groaning under: And were the Legiſlature ſolely in Their hands, They cou'd hardly eſcape being blamed for every Thing the People might think a Grievance. But now when a Parliament meets once a Year, the Prince gets the Condition of the People in the moſt remote Corners of the Kingdom repreſented: And the People cannot but be ſatisfied, when they conſider they are governed by no other Laws, nor burden'd with other Taxes, than what were asked and enacted with their own Conſent; or, which is the ſame Thing, by Repreſentatives of their own chuſing. Juſt ſo, Miniſters, through their retired Courſe of Life, are ordinarly very much Strangers to the Way of the World, and are ready to meaſure the World by the Abſtract Notions they have gathered out of Books or from their own Solitary Muſings, which don't always ſuit with the Practical Part of Life. Hence it comes to paſs that, till Age and Experience have mellowed 'em, they are apt to have too much Keeneſs on their Spirits, and to expreſs too much Rigour in their Actings. But *Ruling-Elders* are more converſant in the World, know better what the Times will bear, and what Allowances are neceſſary to be made in this or that Caſe. Now when the People (in the Caſe of Scandals) ſee themſelves judged by ſuch *Perſons*, and that there is no other Diſcipline exerciſed on 'em but what even their own Neighbours, as well as their Miniſters, think reaſonable, they can have no juſt Cauſe of Complaint.

To conclude. It is very Strange that the Epiſcopal Writers ſhou'd inveigh againſt Officers whoſe *Province* it is only to *Govern*, not to *Preach*, I mean by themſelves, ſeeing they have loudly proclaimed to the World, that they look upon their Biſhops only as ſuch. Thus, Dr. *South* (*d*) in his Sermon preached

[d] Vol. I. P. 209. &c.

ed at the Consecration of the Bishop of *Rochester* upon *Titus* II. *verse* ult. *These things speak and exhort*, in a flat Contradiction to the Text saies, 'That a teaching Talent *is not absolutly ne-* 'cessary in a *Bishop*, *nor is of the vital Constitution of his Function.* 'If he have it, it is not to be refused; but if he have it not, it 'is not much to be desired. And if any of their Bishops do make Conscience of constant preaching, as some of them have done, it is reckoned a *Labour of Love*, as not having a *Care of Souls*. Thus the Bishop of *Sarum* in his Funeral Sermon on Dr. *Tillotson* the late Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*. 'In his Function, *saith He*, He 'was a constant Preacher: For tho' he had no *care of Souls* upon 'him, yet few that had laboured so painfully as he did. And yet the Arch-Bishops and Bishops have, above all the other Clergy, the greatest Honour and the largest Provision. I wonder upon what Account, if it be none of their Duty to *labour in the Word and Doctrine*. And I wonder how *Episcopal* Ruling-Elders can be lawfull, and *Presbyterian* Ruling-Elders not so. But enough of this.

ARTICLE II.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Reasonings against the Presbyterian* Deacons *are Examined.* P. 106. 107.

1. HE Objects that *the Primitive Deacons did Preach and Baptize, which the Presbyterian Deacons cannot do, therefore they are not the same.* 'Tis answered. The Scripture Deacons by virtue of their Office were neither to preach nor Baptize, but to *serve Tables*: For the Apostles unloaded themselves of the latter Function,

 because

becauſe they could not, with it, diſcharge the former *Acts* VI. 2 *It is not reaſon that we ſhould leave the Word of God and ſerve Tables.* But, ſaies Mr. *Rhind*, *Philip* who was ordain'd a Deacon *Acts* VI. *did Preach and Baptize Acts* VIII. 12. 13. 'Tis anſwered. 1ſt, We have heard *Hilary* before declaring, that it was allowed to all in the Beginning to preach the Goſpel and to Baptize. 2ly, *Philip* was an *Evangeliſt*, and in that Capacity preached and Baptized. But, ſaies Mr. *Rhind*, *we read of no ſecond Ordination He had for theſe Purpoſes.* Is not this pretty? Is he not expreſly called an *Evangeliſt Acts* XXI. 8. And ſhall we think he took up the Office at his own Hand, without being ordain'd to it; becauſe we do not read of his Ordination? Or does he think that *Evangeliſts* had not Power to Baptize? But, *adds he*, 'we find *Peter* and *John* com-'miſſioned by the *Apoſtles* to confirm the *Samaritans*, which Office 'Philip cou'd have diſcharged had he been an *Evangeliſt*. I anſwer. He could not: For the *Confirmation* that is there meant is the giving of the Holy Ghoſt in his extraordinary *Chariſmata*, as is evident from the whole Hiſtory: And this none but the Apoſtles could give; nor is there one Inſtance, either in the Scripture or Church Hiſtory, where ever any but the Apoſtles either did or could give it. But Mr. *Rhind* has ſtrongly imagined that the preſent Uſage among the *Prelatiſts* is according to the New Teſtament Practice; whereas indeed Epiſcopal *Confirmation* is a thing unheard of in the Scripture, and ſo is a *baptizing Deacon*. Nor can I look upon Baptiſm adminiſtred by an *Epiſcopal* Deacon, any otherwiſe than as if it had been adminiſtred by a *Webſter* or *Cobler* Ruling Elder or Deacon among the Presbyterians. I'm ſure there is not the leaſt Countenance for it in the Scripture. I'm ſure the very Deſign of the Deacon's Office declares that *Baptizing* is no part of it. I'm ſure likewiſe the Presbyterian *Deacon* is the only *Deacon* by Scripture warrant, when the word is taken as ſignifying an Officer inferior to a Presbyter.

II. He objects 'That the ancient Deacons did conſtitute one 'of the Ordinary and perpetual Orders of Eccleſiaſticks, whereas 'the Presbyterian Deacons are only in a few of the larger Towns, 'there being *none* ſuch in any other Part of the Nation. 'Tis anſwered. They are in *every* Congregation where they can be had:

And

And to my certain Knowledge in the *lesser* as well as *larger* Towns; yea in many *Country* Congregations. And every Minister is posed upon it by the Presbytry twice a Year, whether his Session be constitute with Deacons as well as Elders. Possibly some Congregations may have little or no Stock; and perhaps as few Poor that want it. What is the great Hazard tho', in such a Case, they have no *Deacons?* O, saith Mr. *Rhind*, *It's a fundamental Defect if they believe them to be of Divine Institution.* Very well argued! As if *Deacons* were absolutly necessary to the Constitution of a Church. But Time was when there were no such Officers in Being, nor any Order for them: Nor in all probability would there ever have been any, had not the emergent Circumstances of the Church made it necessary. How many Instances have we in Church History of *Bishops* without *Presbyters*? But was that a fundamental Defect? Or wou'd it be sufficient whereupon to infer, that *Presbyters* are not Church Officers; or that the Office is not of Divine Institution? 'Tis Nauseous to answer such Stuff. So much for the Presbyterian Deacons.

The Conclusion of the Chapter concerning Church-Government.

THUS now I have got through the Controversy of the *Government* of the Church; and hope I have made it sufficiently clear that, neither from the Nature of the Thing, nor the Form of Government among the *Jews*, nor Political Necessity, nor the Institution of our Lord, nor the Practice of the Apostles, nor the pretended Episcopacy of *Timothy* and *Titus*, nor the Apocalyptick Angels, nor the Testimony of Antiquity, nor indeed from any Thing else Mr. *Rhind* has advanced, does it appear that by Divine Right there *is*, or *ought* to be any Officer in the Church superiour to the preaching *Presbyter*. Consequently the *Presbyterian* Government

is not Schismatical, but that which was originally instituted, and did at first obtain. Consequently Mr. *Rhind* in separating from it (the same is to be said of all others in his Case) is become a *Schismatick*. Consequently *Episcopal* Ordination is so far from being necessary, that it is *without*, and therefore contrary to *Divine* Institution.

And now to conclude. I cannot but look upon it as one of the nicest Turns I ever heard was given to a Cause, that our *Scotch* Episcopalians who, the other Day while they were in Possession, were glad to find a few Colours, and watery ones they were God wot, to prove Episcopacy *Lawfull*; and would have been heartily well content if People would have acquiesced in it as *Tolerable*; that they, I say, should, now when they had lost all, set up for the Absolute *Necessity* of it, and hope to recover the Sadle by that Politick; I cannot help saying in the Words of *Catullus*.

Res est Redicula & nimis Jocosa.

'Tis much such an other Trick as the Church of *Rome* serves the Protestants: When she finds her Religion almost one continued Scab of Errours and Corruptions, she puts on a brazen Impudence, and will needs have them to dispute her Infallibility. I must then advise our Episcopal Writers to be so modest as not to grasp at all; but to content themselves, as their Fathers did before them, with Essays to prove the *Lawfullness* of Episcopacy, without insisting on the *Necessity* of it. And as for others, besides the Clergy, who are become Disciples to this new *Hypothesis*, I cannot but seriously exhort them to consider the horrid Uncharitableness and bloody Cruelty of it, no where to be parallelled except amongst the most bigotted *Papists*. I crave leave then to address you in a few Words.

I hope, *Gentlemen*, you know that there are other Churches in the World besides the Presbyterians in *Scotland*, which neither believe the Necessity of Bishops, nor maintain Union with them. There are our Brethren Dissenters in *England* and *Ireland*, a pretty considerable Body. There was the *French* reformed Church while she stood, and what yet remains of Her in a dispersed Condition. There are the *Belgick* Churches, the Church of *Geneva*, the Reformed

med *Cantons* with their Proteſtant Confederates; and *New England* on the other Side of the World, all which own no ſuch Office as that of a Dioceſan Biſhop. Now, pray *Gentlemen*, do ye think it Nothing to unchurch all theſe; and, which is the neceſſary Conſequence of that, to give them to the Devil; when yet all the World ſees that, generally ſpeaking, their Converſation is at leaſt as good and as becoming the Goſpel as your own? Do ye think it nothing, by your bigotted Notions thus to weaken the *Proteſtant* Intereſt, and to make ſuch a dangerous Conceſſion to the *Papiſts*; that ſo fair a Part of the Proteſtant World is in a State of Schiſm, out of Favour with God, and incapable of Salvation: And all this meerly for the want of *Prelates*, of whom there is not the leaſt Mention in Scripture?

And yet the malign Influence of your Principle does not ſiſt within theſe Bounds I have mention'd. No. All the Churches who have only *Superintendents* are in quite as dangerous a Condition as the former. For, beſides that theſe Superintendents poſitively diſown their Superiority over their Brethren to be by *Divine* Right; we have p. 45 heard M. *Dodwell* declaring, that they are not ſufficient for a Principle of Unity, and conſequently cannot be the *Medium* of Union with Chriſt. Now, pray conſider what a Havock this muſt needs make of the remaining Proteſtant Churches. Leſt you ſhould think me partial in giving the Detail of 'em, take it in *Stillingfleet*'s Words. 'In *Holſtein*, ſaith he (*e*), '*Pomeren*, *Meclenburg*, *Brunswick*, *Lunenburg*, *Bremen*, *Oldenburg*, '*Eaſt Frieſland*, *Heſſen*, *Saxony*, and all the upper Part of *Germany*, 'and the Proteſtant Imperial Cities, Church-Government is in the 'Hands of *Superintendents*. In the *Palatinate* they have *Inſpectors* 'and *Præpoſiti*, over which is the Eccleſiaſtical Conſiſtory.---- And 'ſo they have their *Præpoſitos* in *Wetteraw*, *Heſſen* and *Anhalt*. 'And in *Tranſylvania*, *Polonia* and *Bohemia* they have their *Seniores*. 'All theſe, *he adds*, acknowledge no ſuch Thing as a Divine Right 'of Epiſcopacy, but ſtiffly maintain *Jerom*'s Opinion of the Primitive Equality of Goſpel Miniſters. And therefore they muſt all go over at the ſame Ferry with plain Parity Men; and you know you

[e] Irenic p. 411.

you have assigned them but indifferent Quarters against their Landing.

Yet further, even in *Denmark*, *Norway* and *Sweden*, tho' there are a few that have the *Name* of Bishops; yet they are very far from being looked on as the Center of Union, or mystical High Priests, or the visible representatives of God and Christ, by whom alone People can have Union with the Divine Persons, which is your Scheme. No, They have no such Whimsies among them on the contrary Writers speak most diminutivly of their Power. 'Here, viz. in *Denmark* '(saith the Author of the *present State of* Europe for the Year 1-05 'p. 134) are *Bishops*, but they are not much different in Effect from '*Superintendents* in other Places, *depending on the Superiour Consi-* 'story.' And (saith the excellent Author of the *Account of Denmark* 'for the Year 1692, Third Edit. p. 231.) there are Six Superin-'tendents in *Denmark*, who take it very kindly to be called *Bi-* 'shops and *My Lord*. There are also four in *Norway*. These have 'no Temporalities, keep no Ecclesiastical Courts, have no Ca-'thedrals, with Prebends, Canons, Deacons, Sub-Deacons, &c. 'But are only *Primi inter Pares*. Thus he. And 'tis certain, that in the Beginning of the Reformation it was *Bugenhagius* (who was but a Presbyter) that ordain'd their first *seven* Superintendents or Bishops from whom all their Succession to this Day does flow (*f*). The same is the Case of *Sweden*. 'The Archbishops and Bishops 'of this Kingdom (saith the forecited Author of the *Present State of* 'Europe p. 147) retain little more than the Name, and a bare 'Primary sort of Superiority over other Superintendents, the establi-'shing of the *Lutheran* Religion having deprived them of the Eccle-'siastical Jurisdiction, which they exercised before the Reforma-'tion. Thus he. And to the same Purpose *Stillingfleet* (*g*) concern-ing both these Kingdoms. 'In *Sweden*, *saith he*, there is one Arch-'bishop and Seven Bishops, and so in *Denmark*, though not with 'so great Authority.

By this Calculation, the whole forreign Reformed Churches will be found to be of Presbyterian Principles, and consequently not

[f] Vide Chytræum Saxon p. 434.
[g] Irenic. ubi supra.

not a true Church among 'em all by your Scheme. You'll perhaps say that as for *Sweden* and *Denmark* 'tis enough to save 'em from the Guilt of Schism, that they have such as are called *Bishops*, how small soever their Authority be, and tho' the *Divine* Institution or *Necessity* of them is not believed. But, pray *Gentlemen*, consider, if their *Practice* save them from the Guilt of *Schism*, does not their *Belief* involve them in the Guilt of *Heresie*? If Union with the Bishop be by Divine Command a necessary Duty, then certainly the Belief of it is a fundamental Article, and consequently the denying thereof, as all those of the *Lutheran* Communion do, must be *Heresie*. And so you have very charitably disposed of all the Protestant Churches, sending them whole Sale to Hell upon the Account either of *Heresie* or *Schism*.

I foresee what Reply you'll make to all this, viz. that the *Uncharitableness* of a Doctrine is no Argument against the *Truth* of it. That our Thoughts don't alter the Nature of Things, nor can change Divine Establishments: And therefore if it be true that *Episcopal* Ordination is necessary to make a Minister, without which his Acts are not valid; and that Union with the Bishop is necessary to eternal Life, without which People cannot expect it: Be the Consequences of this never so heavy, or extend themselves to never so many, that is what you cannot help: The Truth must be maintain'd; and that you express your Charity sufficiently by telling us of our Danger, and that it would be the most uncharitable thing in the World to conceal the same from us, or to shew it less than really it is. To which I answer. 'Tis very true, our Thoughts don't alter the Nature of Things, nor will your Rigour or our Charity make the other's Principles either truer or falser. But tho' it do not *make*, yet it may go a great length to *shew* whether they be true or false. For, 'tis a shrewd Presumption in most Cases, that the Opinion which wants Charity is not from God, and that the Errour lyes on the Damning Side. This the Divines of the Church of *England* have oftimes observed in their Disputes against the Church of *Rome*; But their late Writers for *Episcopacy* quite forget it in dealing with the Presbyterians. A good and wise Man, even tho' he have the Truth on his Side, will yet make all the Allowances the Case will reasonably bear for those that differ from him. He will consider that

that their dissenting from him may proceed from Education, the Difficulty of the Controversie, the want of due Helps or of a suitable Genius and Capacity. And if he himself make Allowances for them on these or the like Accounts; He will readily believe that a mercifull God will do so much more. But when a Man's Mind is darkned with Errour, at the same Time his Temper is sowred: And because he cannot *Reason* others into the same Opinion with himself, therefore he essays to *fright* them into it with the Argument of Damnation. And this, *Gentlemen*, I must take the Freedom to say, I apprehend to be your Case. For, Pray, whence all this Height? On what is all this Assuming in your own Case founded? Mr. *Rhind*, to give him his due, has laid out all your best Arguments in their Strength, and set them off with Abundance of Elegancy; I appeal to your selves whether every one of them is not answered to Satisfaction.

I. Is it on the *Scriptures* you found? M. *Dodwell* has fairly quitted that Fort, and frankly owns that your *Prelacy* is not to be found there: And that the Original of it is at least *ten* Years Posterior to the Sealing of the Canon of the Scripture, and half a *Dozen* years to the Death of *John* the longest lived of the Apostles. And as to the Business of *Ordination* which you so much insist on, He not only supposes (*h*) that *Presbyters* might chuse their *Bishop* might use all the Ceremonies of *Consecration* to him, might invest him in his Office by *Prayer* and *Imposition* of *Hands*: But also tells, 'that he is apt to think that this *must* have been the Way observed at first in the making of *Bishops*. Now, if the Presbyters have Power of Ordaining *Bishops*, is it not strange that they should want the Power of Ordaining *Presbyters* like themselves? Has God any where forbidden it? No. But Mr. *Dodwell* would perswade us of it by a *Simile*, which yet is but a weak way of arguing, *viz.* That as though a Prince is inaugurated by his Subjects, yet when once he is inaugurated, they have not any Power over him, nor can act any thing without him, or withdraw their Obedience from him, so neither can the Presbyters, when once they have Ordain'd a Bishop over themselves, do any Thing either without him or in Opposition to him; and that all such Acts are not only

[h] Separat. of Churches. Chap. XXIV. p. 322.

only punishable but invalid. But all this Reasoning is founded on two most precarious Suppositions *viz.* 1*st*, That the *Presbyters* are obliged to have a Bishop over them. And 2*dly*, That every Bishop is a Monarch in his own Dioceſs, for which there is just as much to be said as there is for the *French* King's being Universal Monarch of the World, or the *Pope* of the Catholick Church. Such Things ought to be *proved* not *presumed*; so much the rather that in Fact we find the Presbyters of the Church of *England*, even the *High-Church* Presbyters, have disowned that Principle. For, in the late famous Contests between the two Houses of *Convocation*, the Plurality in the *lower* House assumed to themselves a Power over, and set themselves in opposition to their Superiours: And would needs have their *Metropolitan* and *Bishops* to be accountable to them for their Conduct in their Visitations, they wou'd needs censure the Bishop of *Sarum*'s Book on the XXXIX Articles: Nay wou'd need's sit, and act too, after the *Metropolitan* their President had adjourned them. By this Conduct of theirs they broke through the *Ignatian* and *Dodwellian* Scheme at once, and loudly proclaimed to the World that they did not believe their Bishops to be absolute Monarchs. Thus the Presbyterians were beholden to the *lower* House of *Convocation*. But indeed the *upper* House obliged them no less. For, the *lower* House, apprised of the Constructions were made of their Actings, on *Dec.* 11. 1702 sent a *Declaration* to the *upper* House whereof the Import was, *That whereas they had been scandalously and Maliciously represented as Favourers of Presbytry, in Opposition to Episcopacy, they now declared, That they acknowledged the Order of Bishops, to be of Divine Apostolical Institution.* Several of the *lower* House had dissented from this *Declaration*, and refused to subscribe it. But did not their *Lordships* in the *upper* House go in to it? No. Notwithstanding the *lower* House by an *additional Address* begged their *Lordships* to abett and support the foresaid Doctrine, yet their *Lordships* objected against the Legality of asserting it, and in end flatly refused it. So that, even in *England* it self, to this Day there has never been any *Declaration* made of the *Divine* Institution of *Prelacy* either by *Parliament* or *Convocation*: Nor can I find that there is any Thing in any of their publick *Formula's* asserting it, except some Words in the Preface to the Form of

Ordination, which are too looſe and weak to bear ſuch a Weight. And 'tis certain, that, at the Reformation, *Prelacy* was ſet up in *England* on a far different Footing from that of *Divine Right*. For in K. *Henry* the VIII's Reign Anno 1539. 'The Biſhops, ſaith Dr. 'Burnet (*i*), took out Commiſſions from the King, by which they 'acknowledged that all Juriſdiction Civil and Eccleſiaſtical flowed 'from the King, and that they exerciſed it only at the King's 'Courteſie, and that as they had it of his Bounty, ſo they wou'd be 'ready to deliver it up at his Pleaſure, and therefore the King did 'empower them *in His ſtead* to Ordain, give Inſtitution, and do all the 'other Parts of the Epiſcopal Function. Upon which the *Hiſtorian* makes this Remark, *By this they were made the King's Biſhops indeed.*

Nor was the Matter mended by K. *Edward* VI. 'In the firſt 'Year of whoſe Reign, *ſays the ſame Hiſtorian (k)*, all that held 'Offices were required to come and renew their Commiſſions. 'Among the reſt the Biſhops came, and took out ſuch Commiſſions 'as were granted in the former Reign *viz.* to hold their Biſhop-'ricks during pleaſure, and were empowred in the King's Name, '*as His Delegates*, to perform all the Parts of the Epiſcopal Fun-'ction, and *Cranmer* ſet an Example to the reſt in taking out one 'of them. And indeed *Heylin* acknowledges (*l*) that K. *Edward*'s firſt Parliament *forced the Epiſcopal Order from their ſtrong Hold of Divine Inſtitution, and made them no other than the King's Miniſters only.*

Upon this Footing was Prelacy ſettled even in *England* at the Reformation: And I challenge any Man to produce Documents where ever to this Day they have bettered its Foundation, or ſettled it upon Scripture Authority or Divine Inſtitution. And muſt the *Scots* Presbyterians be *Schiſmaticks* for not believing what the whole Forreign Proteſtant Churches have declared againſt, and *England* her ſelf durſt never aſſert. *Gentlemen*, I can aſſure you there is Nothing in the World makes a Party appear with a more Contemptible Figure than weak Arguments and a high Air. Pleaſe there-

[*i*] Hiſt. Reform. Abridg. Vol. I. p. 228.
[*k*] Ubi ſupra. Vol. II. p. 4. [*l*] Hiſt. Edw. VI. p. 52.

therefore only to low'r your Air in proportion to your Arguments, and I hope it will be no hard Matter to deal with you. 'Tis true your late Writers will needs perſwade you that all Chriſtianity depends on Prelacy, and that there cannot be any Church where it obtains not; and their Plot, *viz.* The Ruin of the whole Proteſtant Intereſt through the World, is too evident either to be miſtaken by us, or coloured by themſelves. But I muſt tell you that *Cranmer*, *Therleby*, *Redman*, *Cox*, *Whitgift*, *Coſins*, *Low*, *Bridges*, *Hooker*, *Dounham*, *Willet*, *Maſon*, *Chillingworth*, *Sutclife*, and all thoſe great Names who, for ſeveral Scores of Years after the Reformation, baffled Popery by their Arguments, or gave Teſtimony againſt it by their Blood; tho' they were deeply engaged in the Intereſts of Prelacy, and loved it with their Soul; yet they ſtill either denyed the *Neceſſity* of it, or frankly diſowned its being founded on *Scripture*. And when the *Scripture* Fort is forſaken, pray what will ye betake your ſelves to. For

II. Will you found on the *Fathers?* 'Tis true your Writers amuſe you with their Names, and dazle your Eyes with Citations out of 'em which mention *Biſhop* and *Presbyter* as diſtinct. But, pray deſire them to cite the *Fathers* declaring for the *Divine Right* of that Diſtinction, as the Presbyterians cite them declaring for their *Scripture Identity*. Without this, all their Endeavours are only a Learn'd Labour to buble the World, and does either diſcover their own, or preſume their Readers want of Judgment. *Stillingfleet* has ſpoken ingenuouſly on the Head. 'As to the Mat'ter it ſelf, ſaith he (*m*), I believe upon the ſtricteſt Enquiry '*Medina*'s Judgment will prove true; That *Jerom*, *Auſtin*, *Am'broſe*, *Sedulius*, *Primaſius*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Theodoret*, *Theophylact*, were 'all of *Aerius*'s Judgment as to the Identity of both Name and Or'der of Biſhops and Presbyters in the Primitive Church. I have ſhewn how, not only theſe but ſeveral others of the *Fathers* are on the *Presbyterian* Side; and acknowledge not only that the Names *Biſhop* and *Presbyter* are Common; but alſo that the Office and Character was the ſame in the Apoſtolick Times. I have produced them interpreting the Scriptures that relate to this Controverſy, as

[m] Irenic. p. 276.

the *Presbyterians* now do. I have ſhewn that the Divines of the Church of *England*, even her *Biſhops* and *Doctors* acknowledge the Fathers to be one the Side of *Presbytry*. If the *Epiſcopal* Writers can produce as many of the Fathers declaring as expreſly for the Superiority of Biſhops above Presbyters by *Divine Right*; if they can find them interpreting the Scriptures that Way, and then back all with the Approbation of our *Presbyterian* Writers, as I have done what I alledged with the Approbation of the *Epiſcopal*; I hereby engage to become their Proſelyt. If this is not to be done, you muſt blame your ſelves you have not moe Diſciples. But, 'tis high Time to proceed with Mr. *Rhind*.

CHAP. III.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Second Reaſon for ſeperating from the* Presbyterian *Party viz.* That their Articles of Faith are fundamentally Falſe and Pernicious, *is Examined. From* P. 119. *to* P. 148.

THIS is a very high Charge, and for making it Good He inſiſts againſt the Doctrine of the *Decrees* in general; the Decrees of *Predeſtination* and *Reprobation* in particular, the Doctrine of the *Efficacy of Grace*, and the Doctrine of the *Perſeverance of the Saints*. For Anſwer, I ſhall *firſt* particularly conſider his Objections againſt theſe Doctrines, and *Secondly* prove that they are the Doctrines of the whole *Chriſtian* Church.

SECT.

SECT. I.

Wherein Mr Rhind's *Objections againſt the Presbyterian* Articles of Faith, *are conſidered.*

IN the *Firſt* Place Mr. *Rhind* inſiſts againſt the Doctrine of the *Eternal Decrees* in General, which in the *Weſtminſter* Leſſer Catechiſm are defined to be *God's eternal Purpoſe, according to the Counſel of His own Will*; *whereby, for his own Glory, He hath foreordained whatſoever comes to paſs.* One wou'd think the Truth of ſuch a Doctrine was beyond Debate. For, doth not the Infinite Perfection of the Divine Nature, and the Dependence of the Creature upon God, in its *Actions* as well as *Being*, argue ſuch Decrees? Does not the infallible Omniſcience of God neceſſarly inferr them? Is it poſſible otherwiſe to conceive how Events, that flow from Rational free-Agents, or depend upon Contingent Cauſes, ſhou'd be certainly *known*, when they are not certainly to *be*? Does Mr. *Rhind* think that God has forſaken the Earth, or laid the Reins on the Neck of the Creatures, allowing them to hurry both themſelves and him whither they liſt? Has he formed his Notions of the Deity upon *Lucretius*'s Syſtem, who would Complement him out of his Concernment for the World. Of the Divine *Decrees* in General.

Immortali ævo ſumma cum Pace fruatur
Semota a noſtris Rebus ſejunctaque longe.

Or doth he think Him ſuch a one as himſelf, to take His Meaſures upon

upon the Spot as he ſees Things are likely to frame? In the Confidence of what did he oppoſe ſuch a Doctrine?

Why, *ſaith He* p. 120, Nothing comes to paſs more frequently than Sin: And therefore if God has foreordained whatſoever comes to paſs, then it will follow that God has ordain'd Sin, and conſequently muſt be the Author of Sin, which is Blaſphemous, and deſtroys the Eſſential Diſtinction 'twixt good and evil, all Juſt Notions of God, the Natural Freedom of Man's Will, takes away Rewards and Puniſhments, and in a Word excuſes the Sinner and lays the Blame upon God. This is the full Sum of what he has offered againſt the *Presbyterian* Doctrine of the *Decrees*. But

I. Theſe are not *Arguments* againſt, but *Conſequences* wrung from it; *Conſequences* too which the Presbyterians refuſe with Abhorrence, and that in their publick *Formula*'s. Thus in their *Confeſſion of Faith* (*n*) They Teach, 'That God from all Eternity did by the 'moſt wiſe and Holy Councel of His own Will freely and un'changably Ordain whatſoever comes to paſs: Yet ſo, as that 'neither is God the Author of Sin, nor is Violence offered to the 'Will of the Creatures, nor is the Liberty or Contingency of ſecond 'Cauſes taken away but rather eſtabliſhed. 'Tis therefore not only uncharitable but unjuſt to load the Doctrine with ſuch Conſequences, when they expreſly declare that they do not underſtand the *Doctrine* in ſuch a Senſe as to admit of theſe *Conſequences*.

II. Cannot Mr. *Rhind* conceive, that 'tis very poſſible for the Divine Majeſty to decree the *Event*, without decreeing the *Sin* that adheres to it, any further than that he will permit, direct, and overrule it, to ſerve his own wiſe and Holy Ends? Whether he can conceive it or not, there is no one Thing more expreſsly laid down in the Scripture than this. I am very ſure that *Shimei* ſinned grievouſly in curſing *David*, and yet I am as ſure that the Lord ſaid unto him *Curſe David* (*o*). I am ſure it was with *wicked* Hands that *Herod*, *Pontius Pilate* and the People of the *Jews* took and crucified and ſlew the Son of God (*p*). But I am as ſure, not only that *He was delivered by the determinate Councel and Foreknowledge of God*, but alſo that They did Nothing to him but what *God's*

[n] Chap. III. Sect. 1. [o] 2 Sam. XVI. 10. [p] Acts II. 23.

God's Hand and Councel determined before to be done (*q*). Are the Expreſſions in the Presbyterian *Catechiſm* harder than theſe of the Scripture? And muſt not *Presbyterians* teach as the Scriptures do, becauſe Mr. *Rhind* will needs harangue a little againſt them?

III. How does the Decree of God excuſe the Sinner? Does not Mr. *Rhind* know, that it is not the *Decree* but the *Precept* that is given to be the Standard of our Obedience? No indeed; this Mr. *Rhind* knew not, or did not advert to: For he has expreſly made the *Decrees* and the *Commands* of God the ſame Thing; and the *Decrees* to be the Rule of our *Duty*. *If*, ſaith he p. 121, *God has decreed Sin, it is our Duty to commit it, His Commands being the Standard of our Obedience.* This is a horrid Blunder he has made. So far are the *Decrees* from being the Rule of our Duty, that it is both impoſſible to know them, and a Crime to enquire into them any further than as God has revealed them in his Word. *Secret Things belong unto the Lord our God: But thoſe Things which are revealed belong unto us.* (*r*) And therefore God very juſtly puniſhes the Sinner, not for fulfilling his *Decrees* in which he was not concerned; but for tranſgreſſing his *Precepts* which he had revealed to him. God decree'd that the Son of Man ſhould be betrayed & betrayed by *Judas* too. *The Son of Man goeth as it was determined* (*s*), yet this Decree could not excuſe *Judas*, becauſe he neither deſigned the fulfilling of it by his Treachery, nor indeed was it given him as the Rule of his Behaviour: And therefore 'tis preſently added *Wo unto that Man by whom he is betrayed.* And therefore when Mr. *Rhind* affirms p. 130 'That it is Nonſenſical and Blaſphemous to ſuppoſe that God's 'ſecret and *revealed* Will are not one, He contradicts expreſs Scripture, and thereby makes himſelf guilty of that Blaſphemy he imputes to others.

IV. Whatever Difficulties there are in the *Presbyterian* Doctrine of the Decrees, the *Arminians* muſt be intollerably fancifull, if they do not own, that they are at leaſt equal on their Side; with this very conſiderable Difference, that generally the Objections againſt the

[q] Acts IV. 27. 28. [r] Deut. XXIX. 29. [s] Luke XXII. 22.

the *Presbyterian* Doctrine arise from pretended *Reason*: Whereas the Objections against the *Arminian* Doctrine are founded, not only upon plain *Reason*, but express Declarations of *Scripture*: And where these are, and the Contest is 'twixt seeming *Reason* and the clear *Revelation* of God; it seems but good Manners to yeild to God. Mr. *Rhind* cannot digest this Doctrine of the *Decrees*, because he cannot (without submitting his Judgment to the Scriptures) by meer Strength of Natural Reason answer all the Difficulties & Objections that may be brought against it. But can he answer all the Difficulties & Objections against a Trinity of Persons in the Divine Nature? Can he answer all the Objections that may be made against the Resurrection of the Body after the Infinite and inconceivable Changes which Time and Corruption bring upon it? If he can answer these, I say, upon the meer Strength of Reason; it must be owned he is the ablest Divine the World was ever yet blessed with. If he will not believe them, because he cannot answer all Objections against them; then 'tis plain he ought to have continued in his State of *Discreet Scepticism* to this Day. But if he can believe these Doctrines notwithstanding his inability to solve the Difficulties that hang on 'em; why might he not also believe that *God has decreed whatever comes to pass*; for the one is as plainly revealed in the Scripture as the other. And

V. There is so much the more Reason for this, that the Belief of the *Decrees* is necessary in order to the Conduct of Life. For when I am afflicted by the Hands of wicked Men and suffer from their Sins, how shall I possess my Soul in Patience, or keep my self from Revenge; if I don't believe that, tho' God has absolutly free of their Sin, yet he uses them as the Tools and Instruments of his Providence for serving his Purposes upon me, and that such Things were measured out for me by his Decree. It was upon this Consideration that *Job* sinned not, nor charged God foolishly, notwithstanding the Injuries the *Sabeans* and *Caldeans* had done him. It was this preserved *Joseph* from all Resentment against his Brethren for their Barbarous Usage of him, *Ye thought Evil against Me, but God meant it unto Good.* Gen. L. 20. It was upon this that *David* quieted his Spirit, and *was Dumb not opening his Mouth, because the Lord had done it* Psalm XXXIX. 9. And what God *does* in Time without Sin, might

he

he not from all Eternity *decree* without Sin. It was upon this Argument that our Blessed Saviour bore the Contradictions and Cruelty of Sinners with a perfect Composure of Spirit. *The Cup that my Father hath given me to drink shall I not drink it.* John XVIII. 11. Nay, even a Heathen *Seneca* prescribes the belief of the Doctrine of the *Decrees* to his Friend as a Remedy against all ruffling of Spirit under Injuries and Troubles. 'Losses, *saith he* (*t*), 'Wounds, Fears are come upon you; these Things are usual. That's 'little, these Things are needfull, they are *Decreed* and don't come 'by Chance. I hope then in all this Doctrine there is nothing either *false* or *pernicious*, much less any Thing that is *Fundamentally* so.

In the *Second* Place, Mr. *Rhind* insists against the *Presbyterian* Doctrine of Gods *Irrespective Decrees* relating to Mankind contain'd in their *Confession of Faith* Chap. III. viz. *That God has, by his Eternal and immutable Purpose & the secret Counsel and good Pleasure of his own Will, chosen some to everlasting Life, without any Foresight of Faith or good Works or Perseverence in either of them. And that he hath, by the same Eternal and unchangable Councel of his own Will, passed by, and ordain'd others to Wrath for their Sin.* Of the Decree of *Predestination.* 'This Doctrine, he 'argues, contradicts the Holiness, Justice and Truth of God, is con-'trary to the Design of all Revelation, and to expres's Testimonies 'of Scripture, and is perniciously influential upon Christian Life. p. 122.----135. 'Tis against my Will that I engage in this mysterious Controversy, in which every Man ought to be Wise to Sobriety. But, I hope, it will not be difficult to suggest as much, as will take off Mr. *Rhind*'s Objections, without going beyond my Line. For answer then

I. It is abundantly Strange that this Doctrine shou'd be opposed by such as have read the Scripture and the Epistles of *Paul*, who has insisted on it at large in the *Eight* and *Ninth* Chapters of the Epistle to the *Romans*; and besides has frequently asserted it here and there in particular Hints which Mr. *Rhind* p. 132. very manner-

[t] Damna, Vulnera, Metus inciderunt; solet fieri. Hoc parum est, debuit fieri. Decernuntur ista, accidunt, Senec. Ep. 96.

nerly calls *diſmembred Shreds*, as if the Apoſtle had loſt his Connexion always when he touched on that Doctrine. But what can Mr. *Rhind* ſay to thoſe many Places of Scripture, which he cannot but know are inſiſted on by the *Presbyterians* in Defence of that Doctrine? Why, he has rid his Hands of 'em by one fearleſs Stroke, boldly pronouncing, in the place juſt now cited, That theſe are the Paſſages *hard to be underſtood* pointed at by the Apoſtle *Peter*, II. Ep. III. 16, *which ſome wreſt to their own Deſtruction.* But who told him that *Peter* pointed at theſe Paſſages? Did any Spirit reveal it to him? Do the Church of *England* Doctors teach him ſo? No ſurely. Drs *Hammond* and *Whitby*, the two moſt famous Expoſitors that have yet appeared, aſſert, that it is the Doctrine of *the coming of our Lord* that *Peter* there points at, and not the Doctrine of Predeſtination, or any Thing near it. And, if Mr. *Rhind* had conſulted the *Greek* Original, he had ſeen that *Peter* did not referr to *Paul*'s Epiſtles, but to the Subjects he had been treating of, when he uſed theſe Words *In which there are ſome Things hard to be underſtood.*

II. 'Tis very true the *Presbyterians* teach, that by the Decree of God, for the Manifeſtation of his Glory, ſome Men are Predeſtinated unto Everlaſting Life, and others foreordained to Everlaſting Death: And there does indeed lye a ſhrewd Objection againſt it viz. *That it is not in the Power of Man to prevent his own Damnation, if he has been foreordain'd to it*: But then (which might have diſcouraged Mr. *Rhind* to bring it into the Field again) the Apoſtle *Paul* both foreſaw it & ſilenced it *Rom.* IX. 14. &c. *What ſhall we ſay then? Is there Unrighteouſneſs with God? God forbid. For he ſaith to Moſes, I will have Mercy on whom I will have Mercy, and I will have Compaſſion on whom I will have Compaſſion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that ſheweth Mercy ----Therefore hath he Mercy on whom he will have Mercy, and whom he will, he hardeneth. Thou wilt ſay then unto Me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath reſiſted his Will? Nay but, O Man, who art thou that replyeſt againſt God?* Here is a full Aſſertion and fair Vindication of the *Presbyterian* Doctrine; and whatever Objections our Minds may raiſe againſt it, yet there is no one Doctrine more clearly expreſſed or ſtrongly aſſerted in all the Scripture than this. And, which confirms all, 'tis beyond all Controverſy, by Obſervations from Providence, that

God

God acts with an Absolute Soveraignty even in the Dispensations of the Means of Grace in Time, which is a certain Document that he acted the same Way in His *Eternal Decrees*. The World was for many Ages delivered up to Idolatry; and since the Christian Religion has appeared, we see vast Tracts of Countries which have continued ever since in Idolatry: Others are fallen under *Mahometanism*: And the State of *Christendom* is in the *Eastern* Parts of it under so much Ignorance, and the greatest Part of the *West* is under so much Corruption, that We must confess the far greatest Part of Mankind has been in all Ages left destitute of the Means of Grace, and great Numbers of Men are born in such Circumstances, that it is morally Impossible that they should not perish in them. If God thus leaves whole Nations in such Darkness and Corruption, and freely chuses others to communicate the Knowledge of Himself to them, then We need not Wonder that he holds the same Method with Individuals, that he doth with whole Bodies: For, the rejecting of whole Nations by the Lump for so many Ages, is more hard to be accounted for by us than the selecting of a few, and the leaving others in that State of Ignorance and Brutality *. But it becomes no Man to quarrel with God, and impeach Him on His other Attributes, because He will exercise His Soveraignty, when we are both assured by the sacred Oracles, and see it with our Eyes in the Course of His Providence, that *His Judgments are unsearchable and His Ways past finding out.*

III. There lyes no Just Objection from this Doctrine against the Holiness, Justice or Sincerity of God. *First*, not against His *Holiness*. He has given Men Holy Laws, he forces none to transgress them. 'Tis true they cannot keep them without his Grace, but is God a Debtor of that to any Man? *Who has first given unto Him, and it shall be recompenced? Secondly*, Not against his *Justice:* For he damns no Man but for Sin, nor does he damn one repenting Sinner and save another; but he damns all Impenitents and saves all Penitents without Respect of Persons. 'Tis true he gives Repentance to some which he denys to others; but that is an Act of his *Grace*, upon which his *Justice* can no more be quarrelled,

* See Bp. Burnet on the XXXIX. Art. p. 154.

than for his giving the Means of Grace to *Christians*, which he has denyed to *Pagans*. Plainly, he created our first Parents Perfect and Upright, he gave them a Power to stand, he did not force them to fall; yet he permitted them to do so through the Freedom of their own Will to which they were left. By their Fall their whole Posterity became at once Guilty and Corrupt, just as a Leprous Parent begets a Leprous Child, and a Rebel Father forfeits the Estate, not only for himself, but for all his Posterity that are, by the meer Strength of Nature, to descend from him, unless they be restored by the Prince's Grace. If when God found all Mankind in this Condition, and from all Eternity foresaw that, by his Permission, they would throw themselves into it; Where is the Injustice in chusing some of them as Vessels of Mercy; and passing by others, leaving them to inherit the Choice which their First Parents or themselves or Both had made for them, and then reprobating them to Damnation for their Sins? Where is there any Thing of Injustice in all this? Nay, Is there not here a most Glorious Scene opened, wherein at once Justice is magnified, and Mercy gratified; and both Love and Reverence secured to the Divine Majesty? And it is upon this Consideration that We find the Apostle *satisfying* the Objection which formerly we heard him *silencing*. *What if God, willing to shew his Wrath, and to make his Power known, endured with much Long-suffering the Vessels of Wrath fitted to Destruction: And that he might make known the Riches of his Glory on the Vessels of Mercy, which he had afore prepared unto Glory.* Rom. IX. 22. 23. *Thirdly*, Not against his *Sincerity*. For, why may not God *require* Obedience from the Elect, when his very *Requiring* it is one of the Means by which he determines them to it. Why may not he *threaten* them with Damnation in Case of Disobedience, when the *Threatning* is the Mean appointed for scarring them from it. Is there any Thing here but the Use of a most *Rational* Mean for compassing a most *Holy* End? Is it any Objection against Providence that the Sun is suffered to shine and the Rain to fall on the Tares as well as the Wheat growing together in the same Common Field, tho' the first are to be burned, the latter to be gathered into the Barn? As little Objection is it in this Case, that while the Elect and Reprobate live mixed together in the visible Church, the *Exhortations* of the Gospel are directed, and the *Offers* of

Life

Life and Salvation made in a general Stile. And, to call this *Dissimulation* and a *Cruel* and *Disingenuous Procedure*, as Mr. *Rhind* does p. 129, when it is so easie to be accounted for by Reason even upon the Presbyterian *Hypothesis*, was the most Presumptuous Blasphemy.

IV. The said *Presbyterian* Doctrine is no way contrary to the Design of Revelation, nor to any one Testimony of Scripture. *First*, it is no way contrary to the Design of Revelation: And Mr. *Rhind*'s Medium, for proving that it is, discovers either a most vitious Mind, or a most Prodigious Ignorance of the Controversy. 'According to this Doctrine, *saith He*, p. 130. our Faith 'and Obedience cannot make our case better nor Worse; it be-'ing unalterably fixed by a Prior Will, *Without Regard to either.* Was it Malice or Mistake made him talk at this Rate? Does not the Apostle teach * that *God has chosen us to Salvation through Sanctification of the Spirit and Belief of the Truth?* Did ever any Presbyterian teach otherwise? Do they ever separate 'twixt the *End* and the *Means?* Don't they constantly affirm that Holiness and Happiness, Sin and Misery are linked together, as in the Nature of the Thing, so also in the Decree of God? To assert then, that the Doctrine of the Decrees supposeth God to admit to Heaven, and dispatch to Hell *without Respect* either to Faith and Obedience on the one Hand, or Infidelity and Impenitence on the other, was to bid a Defiance both to Modesty and Truth. *Secondly*, It is not contrary to any Testimony of Scripture. Mr. *Rhind* instances two. The first is 1 *Tim.* II. 4. *That God wou'd have all Men to be saved.* But, were that to be understood of God's *Secret* Will, pray how cou'd any Man be lost; *For who hath resisted his Will? The Council of the Lord standeth fast, and the Thoughts of his Heart to all Generations* †. The meaning of the Place then is obvious *viz.* That we should pray for Kings and all that are in Authority as well as for others, because there is no rank or Order of Men whose Faith and Obedience he will not accept of, and upon it save them at the last; In Token whereof he has given them his *revealed* Will which *commands all Men every where to repent*; And 'tis with respect to this, that he is said to *will* that they should be saved, and

* 2 Thess. II. 13. † Rom. IX. 19. Ps. XXXIII. 11.

and not with reſpect to any uncertain hovering Purpoſe to be determined by the Creature, which is a Thing inconſiſtent with the Perfection of his Nature. The other Scripture is *Mark* XVI. 16. *He that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved, but he that believeth not ſhall be damned.* ‘ Which, *ſaith he*, plainly ſuppoſeth, that a Man ‘ may or may not believe. But this is manifeſtly falſe. The Deſign of the Text is not to ſhew what Man *may* or *may not* do, but to expreſs the Connexion there is 'twixt Faith and Salvation, Infidelity and Damnation. Faith is not of the Growth of our own Nature or Will, but is the Effect of the Operation of the Sprit of God; and to deny this, as Mr. *Rhind* does all along, is quite to ſubvert the Goſpel. To theſe two Sciptures he adds p. 131 an Argument which is this. ‘ All to whom the Goſpel is preached are obliged to be- ‘ lieve that Chriſt is their Saviour and died for them. But none ‘ can be bound to believe a Lie, therefore Chriſt moſt certainly ‘ died for all to whom the Goſpel is revealed; and if ſo, then the ‘ Doctrine, which aſſerts the Salvability only of a ſelect Few, is demon- ‘ ſtrativly falſe. But this Argument ſtands on a lame Foot. All, to whom the Goſpel is preached, are indeed obliged to believe in the general, that Chriſt died for, and is the Saviour of all that believe; and from thence, if they (with the joint Teſtimony of God's Spirit) are conſcious to themſelves, that they do believe with ſuch a Faith as is neceſſary to Salvation; They may confidently inferr that Chriſt died for them and is their Saviour; but to believe that Chriſt died for me in particular, while I make no Conſcience of anſwering the Terms of the Goſpel, is to believe without both Warrant and Evidence. The Foundation then of his Argument being falſe, the whole Frame of it muſt needs fall to the Ground.

V. I add that this Doctrine has no pernicious Influence on the Chriſtian Life, when it is improved as it ought to be. Mr. *Rhind* expreſly aſſerts, p. 132, that it has, as running People into the moſt ſinfull *Security*, or into the height of *Deſpair*, beyond the Capacity of a *Calviniſt* Caſuiſt to give Check to either. But, in Oppoſition to Mr. *Rhind*, I affirm with the Church of *England*, in her XVII. *Article*, ‘ That tho' for Curious and Carnal Perſons, lacking the ‘ Spirit of Chriſt, to have continually before their Eyes the Sentence ‘ of God's Predeſtination, is a moſt Dangerous Dounfall, whereby the

'the Devil doth thruſt them either into Deſperation, or into wretch-
'leſneſs of moſt unclean Living, no leſs perillous than Deſperation.
'Yet the Godly conſideration of Predeſtination and our Election in
'Chriſt is full of Sweet, Pleaſant, and unſpeakable Comfort to God-
'ly Perſons, and ſuch as feel in themſelves the Working of the
'Spirit of Chriſt, mortifying the Works of the Fleſh, and their Earth-
'ly Members, and drawing up their Mind to High and Heavenly
'Things, as well, becauſe it doth greatly eſtabliſh and confirm their
'Faith of Eternal Salvation to be enjoyed through Chriſt, as be-
'cauſe it doth fervently kindle their Love towards God. Thus
far the Church of *England*. Beſides, 'tis plain from the Nature of the Thing, that the ſaid Doctrine teaches one to think meanly of himſelf, and to aſcribe the Honour of all to God: Which lays in him a deep Foundation for Humility; and that it inclines to ſecret Prayer, and to a fixed Dependance on God; which naturally both brings his Mind to a good State, and fixes it in it (*v*). And, which confirms all, we ſee in *Fact* that theſe that believe that Doctrine, are generally ſerious and concerned about their Soul, ſo that the Goodneſs of their Heart is an Argument of the Rightneſs of their Head. I don't know if as much can be ſaid of ſuch as go on the contrary Syſtem. Sure I am, they are under ſhrewd Tentations to procraſtinate the Work of their Souls: For when the *Scripture* tells one, that all that believe and repent (at what Time ſoever it be) ſhall be ſaved: And Mr. *Rhind* tells him, that he may repent and believe when he will, that he has it in his own Power to do ſo, without the Aſſiſtance of any *uncommon* Grace; if the Man believe both theſe; I mean, both the *Scriptures* and Mr. *Rhind*'s Doctrine; I referr it to any one to ſay, whether in that Caſe, Curruption will not incline him to take his Swing in Sin, in hopes that he may have a quiet Hour at Death to diſpatch all his Buſineſs. But enough of this.

In the Third Place, the next *Presbyterian* Doctrine which Mr. *Rhind* attaques is that concerning the *Efficacy of Grace*. *They teach*, ſaith he p. 135, *that God, to attain his Eternal Purpoſe, does by an* irreſiſtible Force *work*

Of the *Efficacy of Grace*.

[v] Bp. Burnet. ubi ſupra. p. 166.

work Grace in the Elect, and at the same Time denys it to the Reprobate. This is horridly False: For they expresly disown all *Force* Resistible or Irresistible in the Operation of Grace; and teach (*x*), that tho' the Elect are *effectually* drawn to Christ, yet it is so, as that they come most *freely*, being made *willing* by his Grace. And is it not very easy to conceive how there may be *Efficacy*, yea and insuperable Efficacy too (which the *Presbyterians* own in this Case) without the least *Force*? Is it not plain, that the greater Evidence there is for any Truth, and the stronger Motives there are to any Duty, the more Pleasure the Soul feels, and consequently the greater *Freedom* it exercises, in assenting to the one, or complying with the other? Is this to make Machines of Men? When a Man tells me, that *two* and *three* make *five*, the Native Evidence of the Proposition commands my Assent. But is there therefore any *Force* offered to my Understanding? Is it not very *possible* for the Spirit of God to set Home the sense of my Danger through sin upon My Conscience so powerfully, that I shall be *necessarly*, tho' without the least *Force*, determin'd to fall in with the Overtures of the Gospel in order to my Salvation? And is it not *needfull* that the Spirit of God do act thus; considering how deeply we are immersed in Corruption, blind to Duty, *dead in Trespasses and Sins*, who cannot *of our selves so much as think on good Thought*? And does not the scripture assure us that the Spirit of God *does* act thus; that He *works in us both to will and to do*; that His *People shall be willing in the Day of His Power*; that He *puts His Spirit within us, and* causes *us to walk in His Statutes?* But Mr. *Rhind* cannot away with this Doctrine, it is with him *opposite to Truth*, and *Destructive of Christian Life*.

First, saith He p. 135. 'it is opposite to Truth. For how can I be 'reasonably commanded to believe and repent, who am supposed to 'have no strength to do either? How cou'd Christ reasonably bid *Lazarus, Come forth*; or the Lame Man, *Take up thy bed and walk*, when the one was Dead, t'other an absolute Criple? Has Mr. *Rhind* with Presbytry renounced the Gospel too? Does he believe there is never any secret Efficay attends the Dispensation thereof? But, adds he, 'How can that in Propriety of Speech be called my Act, 'which was never elicited by me? Very Strong! Because another raised

[x] Confess. of Faith Chap. X. Sect. 1.

raiſed me up, therefore my ſtanding or walking is not my Act! Becauſe, when I was lying Dead in Sin, the Spirit of God quickened me to repent and believe; therefore, *repenting* and *believing*, when I am quickened, is not my Act! Becauſe Chriſt *draws* me, therefore it is not *I* that run, notwithſtanding he has *made me willing* to it! Was this to Argue?

Secondly. 'It is, *ſaith he* p. 136, deſtructive of Chriſtian Life, in 'that it excuſes the greateſt Villanies under Pretence of exalting 'the free Grace of God, and diſcourages all the good Endeavours 'that ſhould be uſed. To make this good, he introduces a *Calviniſt* Teacher endeavouring (but without Poſſibility of Succeſs) to reclaim a *Debauchè* of the Party. Mr. *Rhind* has acted the *Debauché*, furniſhing him with Arguments, formed, as he imagines, upon the Presbyterian *Hypotheſis*. *I* ſhall crave leave to act the *Calviniſt Teacher*; and dare promiſe, tho' not actually to convert the *Debauché*, that is God's Work, yet to ſatisfie his Objections even by the *Presbyterian* Scheme of Principles. The *Dialogue* then ſtands thus.

Dialogue between a Calviniſt Teacher, *and a* Debauché *of the Party.*

Calv. Sir, I find you ſtill going on in a Courſe of *Debauchery*; I have often told you before, and now tell you once more, that unleſs you reform you'll go to Hell.

Deb. Alas, Sir, you know, that I cannot effectually reform without irreſiſtible Grace, and I am not to blame that I am not yet Paſſive of it. p. 136.

Calv. What, Sir! cannot you give over your *Debaucheries*, your Drinking, Curſing, Swearing, Whoreing, Gameing, without irreſiſtible Grace? Did I ever teach you ſo? Have not I always told you, that a Man may reform theſe Vices without *Special* Grace? How can you ſay, that *you* are not to blame that you have not yet been Paſſive of Grace? Have you uſed the Means, cultivate your Natural Faculties, improved your Reaſon? When you have not

been faithfull in that which is leſs, why ſhould God commit to your Truſt that which is more? Are not *you* then to blame? That which God has already given you was ſufficient whereupon to have either prevented or broken off a Courſe of *Debauchery*; nay, as I have often told you before, you might have gone, upon the meer Strength of Nature, as far as ever a *Plato* or *Seneca* went.

Deb. True, Sir. But even then my beſt Actions, without this Grace, wou'd be but ſo many *Splendid Sins*. p. 137.

Calv. Right. But is it not better that you ſhould be guilty only of theſe *Splendid Sins*; that is, Actions which, tho' not fully acceptable with God through want of a right Principle and Chriſtian Motive; yet have not only the *Colour*, but *Matter* too, of Virtue; and make one that he is *not far from the Kingdom of God*; were not this better, I ſay, than that you ſhould ſwill (as you do) in Vice and Senſuality; and make your ſelf the Reproach of Humane Nature, and the Scandal of the Town?

Deb. But, Sir, the Reformation which you preach can be of *no Advantage* to my *Soul* without Grace; and ſeeing this Grace is not in my Power, I hope you will, and it is but *reaſonable* you ſhou'd, allow me to *gratifie* the *Body*, ſeeing the contrary cannot *in the leaſt* advance the Intereſt of my *Soul*. *ibid.*

Calv. What do I hear! Wou'd ſuch a Reformation be of *no Advantage* to your *Soul*? Not *in the leaſt* advance the Intereſt thereof? Where did you learn ſuch Divinity? Are there no Degrees in Guilt? And is it not a huge Advantage to want the leaſt Degree thereof; ſeeing your Puniſhment in *Hell* muſt riſe in Proportion thereto, in Caſe you repent not: Or the Stingings and Remorſe of your Conſcience *here*, even ſuppoſe you do? And is the unſincere and tranſitory Pleaſure of Sin to be laid in the Ballance with either of theſe, even in Point of plain Reaſon? But, abſtracting from the Advantage ſuch a Reformation wou'd be of to the *Soul*, is it *reaſonable* I ſhou'd allow you to *gratifie the Body* with Vice? Vice I ſay, whoſe Pleaſures are hollow in the preſent Enjoyment, and will at long run ruin your *Body*, and all your temporal Intereſt: When even that Virtue, which you may attain to by Strength of Reaſon, carries its own Reward in its Boſom; and recommends it ſelf both by the much more manly Pleaſures which *attend* its Exerciſe

ercise, and the solid Advantages that *follow* upon it even in this Life. Don't you see the *Drunkard* for the most part reduced to Poverty, while the *Sober* Man by good Managment and industrious Frugality enjoys a comfortable Competency? Have not you observed the *first* seized with burning Fevers? or surprized with a sudden Death, drowning in his own Vomit; while the *other* has enjoyed a healthfull and vigorous Age? Did you never see the Ruins of *Lust* in the old *Adulterer*; his weak Limbs, and meagre Carcase, and his Body as loathsome as his Name? Have you not observed what Confusion, Jealousies, Discords and Misunderstandings such leud Persons have begot both in their own and their Neighbour's Family? Has not this one Sin ruined some of the greatest Families, and left the fairest Estates without Heirs? While on the other Hand the chast and continent Person has retained a healthfull Body, a savoury Name, and left a numerous Posterity behind him. So that, upon the whole, your reforming from your open *Debaucheries* is in your Power by the Strength of Nature: And is the most preferable Course in Point of Reason.

Deb. But I am uncertain whether I be one of the Elect or Reprobate. *Ibid.*

Calv. No wonder truly; seeing you still continue in your *Debaucheries*: For, *the Sanctification of the Spirit, and the Belief of the Truth* are both the Fruits and Evidences of Election; of which no Man can possibly be certain *without* them; nor, in an ordinary Way, but *by* them.

Deb. But my Practice depends upon my Knowledge of this. For if I be one of the *Elect*, I will sometime, were it only at the Hour of Death, be determined by this Grace, and so will certainly be saved, notwithstanding the Leudness of my bygone Life; and if I be not, why should I abstain from Sin, when an Abstinence, without Grace, can be of no use to me? And this Grace I cannot command: And if I be none of the Elect, I am not to expect it: Therefore, seeing I am to forfeit the Joys of Heaven, which is my Misfortune not my Fault, you must excuse me if I do not lose the Pleasures of Sin, which I may so freely enjoy? *Ibid.*

Calv. Pray Sir, does either Reason or Scripture dictate such a Conduct to you? Or are these rational Inferences from the Doctrines

ctrines of *Election* and *Grace* which you have been taught? Is it not neceſſary in all Sciences to begin at what is moſt eaſie and obvious, and thence to come to the Knowledg and Certainty of what is more difficult? Are you not ſenſible that (beſides all the other Flaws in your Reaſoning, ſuch as, *the uſeleſſneſs of an Abſtinence from Sin*, which I have already diſcourſed) you begin at the wrong End? Whether you are of the Elect or not is a ſecret with God; not otherwiſe to be diſcovered by you, but by the Fruit of it, I mean, Holineſs in Heart and Life. This God has enjoined in his *revealed* Will; and therefore it is your Duty to Study and endeavour it, without fear of any latent Decree lying againſt you: And if you attain to it, you may then moſt certainly inferr from it both your Election and Salvation. But you will needs invert God's Order, you muſt needs firſt know his *ſecret* Will, before you apply your ſelf to obey his *revealed* Will; whereas he has enjoined you to obey his *revealed* Will; and thence to gather his *ſecret* Will concerning your ſelf. For ſhame, Sir, make better uſe of your Reaſon. Apply your ſelf to your Duty which you are ſure you ought to do; and don't expect to be ſaved in the Neglect of it upon the Account of your *Election*; when God has expreſly ſaid that *he has choſen us that we ſhould be Holy*. Neither be diſcouraged from it with the Aprehenſion of your *Reprobation*; ſeeing you own your ſelf to be *uncertain* of it: For who would baulk *certain* Duty for *uncertain* Danger? No rational Man would reaſon ſo weakly about his temporal Affairs.

Deb. But, Sir, whether I be of the Elect or Reprobate, there is no doing of my Duty, ſhould I never ſo much endeavour it without Grace; and therefore whether I will or not, I *muſt continue as I am* untill it ſhall pleaſe God to determine me by his irreſiſtible Power. *Ibid.*

Calv. How Sir! May not ye do more than ye do? Have not I ſhewn you how far you may go upon Strength of Nature or common Grace? What neceſſity then are you under to *continue as you are*? Beſides, if together with other Means you wou'd pray to God for *effectual* Grace, you ſhou'd certainly obtain it; if you do not, you are inexcuſable.

Deb. Oh, Sir, what an idle Exhortation is that? For, tell me I beſeech

beseech you, is it not the Prayer of Faith which only prevaileth with God? *Ibid.*

Calv. Right. It is so.

Deb. And is not Faith the Effect of his *irresistible* Grace? *Ibid.*

Calv. True. Of his *insuperable* Grace it is: For, as for these Terms of *Resistible* and *Irresistible*, they were first contrived or occasioned by the *Arminians* in this Controversy.

Deb. Well then, if my Prayer be acceptable, I have this Grace, and it is needless to pray for what I have already. p. 138.

Calv. That's a false Inference: For Faith and every other Grace is both preserved and increased by Prayer and other Means to be used by us; tho' it is indeed needless to pray for the *first* Gift of Faith, after I am *sure* that I have it, which, I suppose you are not.

Deb. Well then, if my Prayer be not acceptable, why should I pray for what I am not to obtain? *Ibid.*

Calv. Poor Sophistry. God *commands* you to pray, and that *Command* makes it your *Duty*: And it is while People are in the way of their *Duty* that God ordinarly comes with his *free Grace*; whereas the Neglect of it renders them certainly inexcusable. Up then and be doing: Break off your Course of *Debauchery* which you are under no other Necessity of continuing in, but what the Habit of it has brought upon you; and ply Prayer with all your Might, which you see you are *obliged* to do by virtue of God's Authority. And assure your self that God will not condemn you for what you *cannot*, but for what you *will* not do. Observe these Things I say, and I hope shortly to have a good Account of you. And I heartily pray God it may be so. Adieu

Thus I have allowed the *Debauché* to argue with all the Strength Mr. *Rhind* cou'd furnish him with from the *Presbyterian* Scheme. And upon the same Scheme I have answered him: And I referr it to the Reader whether, if Corruption don't prevail over Principle, the *Debauché* is not obliged even by the Presbyterian Principles to mend his former leud Life, and in a hopefull Way to make a good Christian (if he will be true to his principles) in Spite of all his Objections. Therefore, which was the thing to be proved, the

the *Presbyterian* Doctrine concerning the Efficacy of Grace is not Destructive of *Christian* Life. And I have taken this Pains, and been so large on this Subject; that I might convince all *Debauchés* on the *Presbyterian* Side, who yet I hope are not more numerous than these on the other, that their Leudness is not owing to their Principles, but to their own vitious Inclinations: And I pray God may bless what I have advanced for the reclaiming them.

Of the Doctrine of *Perseverance.*

In the *fourth* Place. The last Presbyterian Doctrine which Mr. *Rhind* impugns is that of *Perseverance*, that the Saints cannot fall away *totally* nor *finally* from the Estate of Grace, but shall certainly persevere therein to the End, and will be Eternally saved.

Now, too sad Experience teaches, that even the *Saints* may through the Temptations of Satan, and the World, the Prevalency of Corruption remaining in them, and the Neglect of the Means of their Preservation, fall into grievous Sins: And for a Time continue therein; whereby they incur God's Displeasure, and grieve his Holy Spirit, come to be deprived of some Measure of their Graces and Comforts, have their hearts hardened, and their Consciences wounded, hurt and scandalize others, and bring temporal Judgments upon themselves. All this the *Presbyterians* acknowledg (*y*). But that they shou'd *totally* and *finally* fall away, the Immutability of the Decree of Election flowing from the free and unchangeable Love of God the Father; the Efficacy of the Merit and Intercession of Jesus Christ; the abiding of the Spirit and of the Seed of God within them; and the Nature of the Covenant of Grace will not suffer us to believe.

But Mr. *Rhind* is of a contrary Mind, and endeavours to disprove this Doctrine from *four* Arguments. P. 138----148.

I. *The Exhortations to Perseverance*, saith he, *the Encouragments promised upon it, and the severe Threatnings in case of Apostacy do evidently suppose the Possibility of a Fall.* I deny it, they are only Means appointed by God for their Perseverance; and do in their own Nature contribute to that End. That cannot be, saith Mr. *Rhind: For that were to contradict the* Confession of Faith *which saies That*

[*y*] Confess. of Faith, Chap. XVII. Sect. 3.

That the Perseverance of the Saints does not depend upon their own Free Will. Strongly argued! Their Perseverance does not depend upon their own Free Will, *Ergo* Exhortations, Encouragments and Threatnings cannot contribute to determine and fix their Will! Our daily Bread comes from God, *Ergo* He cannot require our daily Labour for gaining it! God has infallibly promised that the Saints shall persevere; *Ergo* he must not use rational Means to make them do so! Mr. *Rhind* it seems must be incurably gone in the *Logicks*.

II. He argues from a Text of Scripture viz. Heb. VI. 5. 6. *It is impossible for those who were once enlightned, and have tasted of the Heavenly Gift, and were made Partakers of the Holy Ghost, and of the Powers of the World to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto Repentance.* 'These, *He alledges* p. 140, are Epithets 'so peculiar to the truly Faithfull, that he *challenges* us to shew 'where *any* of them, much less *all* together, are applyed to any 'other in the Scriptures, and yet such might fall away. A fair Challenge. But then very unhappily, there is not *one* of these Epithets peculiar to the truly Faithfull. Not *one* of them but what is found to be applyed to Wicked Men or Hypocrites; yea sometimes they are *all* applyed together to such. Plainly the Meaning of the Text is, that such as have been convinced of the Truth of the Christian Religion, and have made publick Profession thereof by Baptism; both which are included in the Term *Enlightened*; and thereupon have *tasted of the Heavenly Gift*, that is, have not only been affected with a temporary Joy, as People naturally are upon Changes; but also, which was very frequent in the Apostolick Times, have been blessed with the extraordinary *Charismata*, Miracles, Tongues, Gifts of Healing and the like, expressed in the Text by being made *Partakers of the Holy Ghost, and of the Powers of the World to come*; if, saith the Apostle, such Persons thus priviledged shall afterwards apostatize to *Paganism*, their Apostacy so hardens them, and lays wast their Conscience in so dreadfull a Manner, that it is impossible for them to return again by Repentance; nor ought they, as some say, be readmitted to the Peace of the Church. This is the Sense of the Text; but where is there any Thing here *peculiar to the truly Faithfull*, any Thing which notoriously

ouſly wicked Men or Hypocrites have not been priviledged with? *Balaam* was *enlightned*, he was the man *whoſe Eyes were open, and who had a Viſion of the Almighty.* Numb. XXIV. 3. 4. Simon Magus *believed and was Baptized* Acts VIII. 13. The ſtony-ground-Hearers *received the Word with Joy*, and yet *they had no Root in themſelves*, and therefore *dared but for a while* Matth. XIII. 20.21. And many will ſay to our Lord at the Laſt Day, *Have we not propheſied in thy Name? And in thy Name caſt out Devils? And in thy Name done many wonderfull Works?* to whom our Lord notwithſtanding will profeſs, not only that He *does not know them*; but that *He never knew them.*

III. He argues from Examples viz. the Glorious *Angels* who became incorrigible Devils, the Innocent *Adam* who became a Child of Wrath, *David* who was deliberatly guilty of Adultery and Murder, *Solomon* who was guilty of repeated Adultery and Idolatry, *Hymeneus* and *Alexander* who were Guilty of Apoſtacy and Blaſphemy.

As for the two firſt Examples, the *Angels* and *Adam*, they are impertinent. It is the Perſeverance of the Saints *under the Covenant of Grace* which the Presbyterians affirm, and not of any Creature *in its natural State.* 'Tis true the beſt Saints cannot pretend to equal either the *Angels* or *Adam* in Holineſs; but it is not upon the Meaſure of Holineſs; but the Immutability of God's Decree, and ſuch other Grounds as I have already mentioned, that the Perſeverance of the Saints depends.

As for *David* and *Solomon*, Mr, *Rhind* does not affirm that they fell *finally* away and were damned; and therefore I need not ſtay to diſprove that they were. The Presbyterians grant that their Grace was not only impaired, but laid aſleep for a Time like live Embers raked up under the thick Aſhes choaking both the Light and the Heat. But Mr. *Rhind* averrs it was *totally* loſt. Let us conſider on what Grounds he averrs this.

Firſt, As to *David*. And here Mr. *Rhind* falls into a Couple of the moſt prodigious Blunders I have readily heard. Take his Words. ' If, *ſaith he* p. 142, this Commination, viz. *that Murderers and Adulterers cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*, be ' not falſe and deluſory, *David* was upon the Commiſſion of theſe ' Sins *liable to Damnation*; and if ſo, he had certainly fallen from the

'the State of Grace; seeing, according to our Adversaries, none 'who are in that State can be *thus liable*. Thus he. Now, *First*, did ever the Presbyterians teach, that none who are in a State of Grace can be *liable* to Damnation? So far from it, that they teach, that there is not one Man even in a State of Grace, who is not *liable* to Damnation. *Secondly*, Is every one who is *liable* to Damnation fallen from a State of Grace? Why then the most Righteous Man on Earth falls from a State of Grace every Day: For he sinneth every Day, and the least Sin makes him *liable* to Damnation, unless Mr. *Rhind* will distinguish Sins into *Venial* and *Mortal*. He has another Proof against *David viz.* 'That having by his Adultery become one 'with an Harlot, he must at that Time have been disjoined from Christ 'according to the Apostle's Doctrine 1 Cor. VI. 15. *Know ye not that 'your Bodies are the Members of Christ*——. But God is represented in Scripture as bearing the Bowels of a Father towards his People. Now a Father may have oftimes Cause to be Angry with his Son, and not only to frown upon him, but to chasten him. But to renounce the Relation of a Father and disinherit him is the last Thing he will do. So in this Case, *the thing that David had done displeased the Lord*, yet as God had a Reserve of Kindness for *him*, as appeared in the Issue: So it is plain that *David* did not *totally* renounce God: And therefore, in his Penitential Psalm on that Occasion, tho' he prayed indeed that God would *restore unto him the Joy of his Salvation*, which intimates that he was under the Frownings of his Countenance, and Tokens of his Wrath: Yet he does not pray that God wou'd *restore his Holy Spirit unto him*, but that he would *not take it from him*, which is at once an Acknowledgment of his Justice, that he might do it; and yet of his Goodness, that he had not done it.

As for *Solomon*, Mr. *Rhind* aggravates his Crimes at a mighty Rate and in the burlesque stile; and indeed they were very great; yet it does not become him nor any Man else to be harder upon him than the Spirit of God in the Scriptures has been. The Scripture indeed says, * *That his Heart was not* Perfect *with the Lord his God*, and that *he went not* fully *after the Lord*: But no where does it insinuate that ever he fell *quite* off from Him. Mr. *Rhind* urges *that the plainest Philosophy teacheth that two contrary Habits can-*

* 1 Kings XI. 4. 6.

not lodge at once in the same Subject; And 'tis very true, that in the *most intense* Degree they cannot: But all the Philosophy that ever was heard of teacheth, and Experience convinceth, that in *more remiss* Degrees they may; and that this was *Solomon*'s Case, the forecited soft Expressions of the Scripture allow us to believe.

As for *Hymeneus* and *Alexander*, the Apostle indeed saies I *Tim.* 1. 19. 20. *that they had made Shipwrack* concerning *the Faith*, that is, they had thrown off the Christian Profession: But he does not say that they had made Shipwrack *of* the Faith; for indeed he never so much as insinuates that ever they had been endued with the genuine Grace of Faith. But, saies Mr. *Rhind*, 1*st*, *How cou'd it offend God, or harm them to lose that which was not the true and saving Faith?* It seems then that when a Wicked man openly renounces Christ, it does not, by Mr *Rhind*'s Account, either offend God or harm Himself. This is pretty strange Doctrine. 2*dly*, saith He, *why should they be delivered unto Satan for renouncing the Faith, if it was not that genuine Grace, when without this* (*according to our Adversaries*) *they were already in his Clutches?* Strong Sense! A scandalously wicked Man is in the Clutches of Satan, why then should the Church, in Case of his Obstinacy, by Excommunication declare Him to be so? Is not this mighty judicious Reasoning? 3*dly*, saith he, *it was the same Faith which* Timothy *is advised to hold in the* 19 *verse*. Right. It was the Christian Faith, the Profession whereof they had cast off, but how does it appear that ever they had been *subjectively* possessed of it? 4ly he excepts upon the 5 and 6 *ver*, where it is said, *Now the End of the Commandment is Charity, out of a pure Heart, and of a good Conscience, and of Faith unfeigned*: *from which some having* swerved, *have turned aside unto vain Jangling*. But the Original Word ἀστοχήσαντες, which is rendered *swerved from* properly signifies *not to aim at*; and so it cannot import that these Persons had ever been possessed of the genuine Grace of Faith. Plainly the Meaning of the Text is, that some Preachers aimed not at the great Design of the Gospel, but went out of the Way to a Divinity made up of empty Words. Thus even Dr. *Hammond* expounds it. But what Relation hath this either to falling or not falling from Grace.

IV. He argues from the Nature of the Thing. *If*, saith he p. 146, *the truly Gracious not only may be, but actually are guilty of very*

we

hainous Sins, which cannot be denyed; then either these sins are Offensive to God or they are not. I answer they are Offensive, and thereby God's Displeasure is incurred, and his Holy Spirit grieved, as we have already heard from the *Confession of Faith*; and therefore Mr. *Rhind* shews what a wretchedly abandon'd Creature he is, when he represents us as teaching, *that the most horrid Impieties are not such when committed by the Saints.* But what would he infer from this, *that the Sins of the Saints are offensive to God?* Why, saith He, *if He be angry with Men because of them, they cannot at the same Time be in His Favour; and if they have lost his Favour, they have fallen from his Grace.* Monstrous Nonsense! A Father cannot frown upon or correct His Son out of Love! He cannot be *Angry* with Him unless He disown Him! A Prince cannot be displeased with His Subjects, but He must instantly denounce them Rebells! This is such weak Stuff that I doubt if it can be paralleled.

Thus now I have gone through the Doctrine of the *Decrees* with its *Dependencies* impugned by Mr. *Rhind.* And tho', I acknowledg, these Doctrines are such as that one cannot have full and adequate Notions of them, the largest Mind being too narrow to comprehend them, the most penetrating Wit to sound all their Depths, and the most indefatigable Study to conquer all the Difficulties that may be charged upon them, any other Way than by submitting our Judgments to the Revelation of God; yet I hope I have made it evident that they are so far from being false; that they are indeed the very Doctrines of the Gospel, and most consistent with a Christian Life. But the Writers of Mr. *Rhind*'s Stamp form to themselves an imaginary Scheme of Chimerical Notions, and having Christned them *Presbyterianism*, they fall a disputing against them; and when they have demolished the Brat of their own Brains, they crow over the conquest as if they had confuted the *Presbyterian* Doctrines. That no Body may be imposed upon by their Misrepresentations; as the Presbyterian's Doctrine may be easily known by their publick *Formula's*, so I shall give a just Representation of the Conduct of their Ministers relating to these Doctrines, which is this.

We never teach our People to take it at first Hand for granted: either that they are of the *Elect*, or that they are of the *Reprobate*, But we teach them *first* to *examine*, and *then* to *conclude*. And in the

the Exercise of this *Examination*, we never teach them to begin at that Question, *Am I elected* ? but at these, *Do I believe ? Do I repent ? Have I a Conversation suitable to the Gospel*? If their Consciences, when throughly examined, give a satisfying Answer to these; we bid them from thence *conclude* their Election, and *exhort* them to go on in *working out their Salvation with Fear and Trembling*. But if their Consciences bring in a negative Answer upon these Questions, we tell them they are in a most dangerous State; yet we forbid them to conclude themselves *Reprobate:* For we do not think, that in the militant Church the Words *Elect* and *Believer* are of the same Extent: All *Believers* are *Elect*, but all the *Elect* are not as yet *Believers*, tho' they certainly shall be so. Upon this Principle we exhort them to use the Means Reading, Hearing, Meditation, Prayer and the like. And tho' we dare not teach them the Doctrine of Merit, either *de Congruo* or *Condigno*; yet we assure them upon God's Promise, that, in the Use of Means, he will not be wanting to them with his Grace. But if they shall continue to neglect the Means, we assure them that final Impenitency is an Infallible Mark of *Reprobation*, and the Cause of *Damnation* : And that it is presumption to conclude themselves elected when they feel not the Gospel Evidences thereof; telling them in the Words of the Apostle, that *God hath chosen us to Salvation through Sanctification of the Spirit and Belief of the Truth.* And to bring home the Title of *Elect* to themselves, otherwise than upon these Evidences, we dare not teach them.

I hope there is Nothing in all this but what is both agreeable to the Scripture, and tends to promote Holiness. Here then I might put an End to this Subject: But there is something further to be done for humbling the *Pride* of these Gentlemen who are so full of themselves upon Mr. *Rhind*'s Scheme.

Sect.

SECT. II.

Wherein is proved, that the Presbyterian Articles of Faith, *impugned by Mr.* Rhind, *are the same with those of the whole Christian Church.*

FOR making this good I assert I. That these Doctrines are the Doctrines of the whole *forreign* Churches that go by the Name of REFORMED: And that, in the Judgment of the highest and most learned *Episcopalians*, neither in these, nor indeed in any Thing else Relating to Doctrine, do they maintain any Thing that is *fundamentally* false. II. That these Doctrines are the Doctrines of those of the *Episcopal* Communion in *Scotland*. III. That they are the Doctrines of the Church of *England*. IV. To compleat all, That the CATHOLICK Church of Christ hath declared these Doctrines to be the Orthodox Faith; and that such as oppose them are worthy of an ANATHEMA. If I shall prove all these Things, and that from uncontested Documents, which I am tolerably sure of doing; I hope it will follow, that these Doctrines can be no just Ground of Separation from the *Presbyterians*; and that such as do separate on the Account of them cannot claim Communion with any Church in the World. Let us try it then.

I. I say that these Doctrines are the Doctrines of the whole *Forreign* Churches which go by the Name of *Reformed*. For proving this I need not appeal to this or the other particular *Divine*. No. I referr the Reader to the *Syntagma Confessionum*, where he may have the *Confessions* of all the Reformed Churches under his View at once. And that they all assert these Doctrines is so evident that no Man ever to this Day denyed it; so that I need not insist. But then, to make this Argument compleat; I add, that in the Judgment of the highest and most learned *Episcopalians*, neither in these, nor indeed in any Thing else relating to Doctrine, do they maintain any Thing that is *fundamentally* false. For this, the Testimony of Mr. *Dodwell* will be sufficient, He, in His Book which I have so often before cited,

cited, I mean the *Paræneſis ad Exteros*, in order to recommend *Epiſcopacy* to the *Forreign* Churches, by ſhewing how much it wou'd conduce to the Good of the Reformation if Biſhops were reſtored, writes thus, 'Were this done, *ſaith he* (*z*) I do not indeed ſee why Communion might not be held with at leaſt all the *Reformed* Churches: For, as for *Socinians*, and Socinianizing *Arminians*, I don't think them worthy the Name of *Reformed*. But as to the reſt, I ſee *no* fundamental Doctrines in which they differ, I mean, which are clearly delivered in the Scripture. And that ſuch only can be called *fundamental* Doctrines, the *Reformed* at leaſt are agreed, nor ought any Doctrines, which are not fundamental, obſtruct Communion with other Churches. Thus far Mr *Dodwell*. 'Tis then a plain Caſe, by His Judgment, that theſe Doctrines which Mr *Rhind* has quarrelled are not *fundamentally falſe*, and that none ought to ſeparate from any Communion on the Account of them; and as little from the Presbyterians in *Scotland* as any. For, I ſuppoſe, every Man will own that there is no Society under the Cope of Heaven more free of *Socinianiſm*, or that favours Socinianizing *Arminians* leſs than they. I hope then the *firſt* Point is fairly gained.

II. Theſe Doctrines which Mr *Rhind* has quarrelled are the Doctrines of thoſe of the *Epiſcopal* Communion in *Scotland*. In all the Revolutions ſince the Reformation wherein ever *Epiſcopacy* got the Aſcendant, we hear but of one *Confeſſion of Faith* formed by them, and that was in the Aſſembly at *Aberdeen Anno* 1616 in which Archbiſhop *Spotſwood* preſided. Now hear ſome Articles of it.

This Glorious God, from *all Eternity*, out of his Wiſdom and Infinite Knowledge *decreed all things* that were after to be done.

This God, before the Foundation of the World was laid, according to the good Pleaſure of His Will for the Praiſe of the Glory of His Grace did *predeſtinate* and elect in Chriſt *ſome* Men and Angels unto eternal Felicity, and *others* He did *appoint* for eternal Condemnation, according to the Council of His moſt Free, moſt Juſt and moſt Holy Will. and that to the Praiſe and Glory of his Juſtice.

By

---

[z] Nec ſane video cur, id ſi fieret, cum omnibus, ſaltem *Reformatis* Eccleſijs, Commercium illud haberi non poſſit. Nec enim dignos eo nomine puto *Socinianos*, nec qui *Socinianis* favent *Arminianos*. In reliquis *fundamentalia* dogmata *nulla* video in quibus diſcrepent, quæ quidem perſpicue tradantur in ſcripturis. Hæc enim ſola *fundamentalia* appelliari poſſe, conveniunt ſaltem Reformati. Nec *debent* alia dogmata obſtare quo minus cum Eccleſijs alijs Communio ſervetur, preterquam fundamentalia. Paræn. Sect 54. p 241.

By the Fall of *Adam* all His Posterity are so corrupted from their Conception and Nativity, that *none* of them *can* do or will *any* Thing *truly* acceptable unto God, till they be renewed by the Will and Spirit of God, and by Faith ingrafted in Christ Jesus.

Albeit all Mankind be fallen in *Adam*, yet *only* these who are elected before all Time, are in Time redeemed, restored, raised and quickened again; not of themselves or of their Works; lest any Man should glory, but *only* of the Mercy of God.

We believe, that albeit the Elect of God, through Infirmity and through the Enticements thereof, sin grievously to the Offence of God, yet they cannot *altogether* fall from Grace, but are raised again through the Mercy of God and keeped to Salvation. Thus the *Scotch* Episcopal *Confession of Faith.*

All this they subscribed with their Hands, confessed with their Mouths, and professed to believe with their Heart, and at the same Time declared the Church of *Scotland* to be *one of the most pure Kirks under Heaven.* What an unaccountable Thing then is it in our *Episcopalians* to object against the Doctrines of their own *Confession of Faith* as *fundamentally* false and pernicious? Have they quite foresworn all Modesty? Will they say that they have altered their *Faith*? If so, let us know when they did it. Let us know where we may find their new *Confession* of it? If these Doctrines are *fundamentally* false and Pernicious, I can never come over to the *Episcopal* Side, nor indeed any Man that regards his Soul: For how well pleased soever I may be with their *Government*, yet their *Doctrines* are damnable. So much for the *Second* Point, which I hope is fairly enough cleared.

III. These Doctrines are the express Doctrines of the Church of *England* in Her XXXIX *Articles.* I before produced the XIII *Article* declaring *Works done before the Grace of Christ to have the Nature of Sin.* Two *Articles* more will be sufficient for my Purpose.

ARTICLE X.

Of Free-Will.

THe Condition of Man after the Fall of *Adam* is such that He *cannot* turn and Prepare Himself by his own Natural Strength and good Works to Faith and calling upon God. Wherefore we have *no* power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the Grace of God by Christ *Preventing* us, that we may have a good will, and *working* with us when we have that good will.

ARTICLE XVII.

OF

Predestination and Election.

PRedestination to Life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the Foundations of the World were laid) He hath constantly decreed by his Counsel, *Secret* to us, to deliver from Curse and Damnation *those* whom He hath chosen in Christ *out of Mankind*, and to bring *them* by Christ unto everlasting Salvation as Vessels made to Honour. Wherefore *they* which be endued with so excellent a Benefit of God, be called according to God's Purpose, by his Spirit working in due Season. *They* through Grace obey the calling, *they* be justified freely, *they* be made Sons of God by Adoption, *they* be made like the Image of His only begotten Son Jesus Christ: *They* walk religiously in good Works, and at length by God's Mercy *they* attain to everlasting Felicity.----

These *Articles* were agreed to in the Year 1562, and are the only authorized Standard to this Day. There are but two Things can be offered to take off the Weight of this heavy Objection *viz.* 1*st* That the Clergy don't receive them as *Articles of Faith*, but as *Vincula Pacis*; or to use Mr *Rhina's* Words p. 119 where he seems to have designed to anticipate this Objection, that it is only an *Acquiescence*

escence not an *inward Assent* that is required. I crave Leave to consider this Defence: And if any Man can take off what I am to offer against it, I shall yield that He has answered my whole Book.

In the *first* Place, admitting the *Articles* were designed not for *Articles of Faith*, but to be *Vincula Pacis*, and that it were only an *acquiescense* in, not an *inward Assent* that were required to them; yet how is it consistent with common Honesty in any Clergy-Man of that Communion to Preach, Print, Dispute against and ridicule the Doctrine contained in them? Is that to *acquiesce* in them? 2*dly*, If the Doctrines contain'd in these *Articles* are *fundamentally* false and Pernicious, how can any Clergy-Man with a good Conscience promise to *acquiesce* in them? If they are of such a damning Nature, is he not obliged under Pain of Damnation to himself to warn People against them? These *two* Things I have suggested upon Supposition that no more but an *Acquiescence* in them were required. But then I add 3*dly*, That that Alledgance is even impudently false. For *first*, the very Title of the *Articles* bears, that they were agreed upon, not only *for the avoiding of the Diversities of Opinions*, but *for the stablishing of* Consent *touching* true *Religion*. *Secondly*, By the XXXVI. *Canon* 1603 all Bishops are discharged to Ordain, admit or License any so much as to Preach, till such Person acknowledge all and every the *Thirty Nine* Articles to be *agreeable to the Word of God*, and subscribe the same willingly and *ex Animo*. Is it Possible that *Articles* can be *agreeable to the Word of God*, and yet at the same Time *fundamentally false and pernicious*? Is it Possible one can subscribe them as agreeable to the Word of God *ex Animo* without *inward Assent*. *Thirdly*, By the *Statute* 13 *Eliz.* 12. It is ordain'd that every Person, to be admitted to a Benefice with Cure, shall, within two Months after his Induction, publickly read the said *Articles* in the Church whereof he hath the Cure in Common-Prayer Time, with Declaration of his *Assent* thereunto; and if afterward he shall maintain *any* Doctrine repugnant to the said *Articles*, and shall persist therein, it shall be lawfull for the Bishop to deprive him. So much for the *first* Defence.

The *Second* is, 'That these Articles being conceived in such general Words, that they may admit of different literal and grammatical Senses, even when the Senses given are plainly contrary

'to one another; the *Arminians* may ſubſcribe them with a good 'Conſcience and without any Equivocation (*a*). But this Defence is yet worſe than the former, if worſe cou'd be. For *1ſt*, Can there be a greater Scandal upon a Church than to repreſent her *Articles of Religion* as a Noſe of Wax, that may be twiſted either to this or the quite contrary Side? Is it Poſſible to elicite Sound and Orthodox Doctrine, and Doctrine *fundamentally* falſe and pernicious out of the ſame Words? *Doth the ſame Fountain ſend forth ſweet Waters and bitter?* *2dly*, Dr. *Sacheverell* moſt juſtly reckons them (*b*) *Falſe Brethren* who expound any of theſe *Articles of Faith* in ſuch a looſe and vagrant Way as may ſute them as well to a *Mahometans* as a *Chriſtian's* Creed. *3dly*, The *Calviniſtick* Senſe (as it is commonly called) was the only Senſe deſigned in theſe Articles: For, the Framers of them were *Calviniſts* themſelves *; and therefore 'tis never to be thought they wou'd frame them ſo as to be Capable of any other Meaning. For pray what cou'd be the Uſe or Effect of an Acknowledgment of, or Subſcription to them on that Suppoſition. *4thly*, The Church of *England* has loudly proclaimed to the World, that She owns theſe *Articles* only in the *Calviniſtick* Senſe: And till *Laud* the Britiſh *Heroſtratus* began to ſet the Nations on Fire, the Church of *England* ſtill proſecuted thoſe that impugned that Senſe of them; And the Noble Lord *Falkland* in his forecited Speech tells us, that the contrary Doctrines had not been oftner preached than Recanted. Plainly, the *Engliſh Univerſities*, the Supreme *Eccleſiaſtical Governours* of the Church, the *Court*, and the *Delegates* to Forreign Synods have all declared for theſe *Calviniſtick* Doctrines, and aſſerted them to be the Doctrines of the Church of *England*.

Firſt I ſay the *Engliſh Univerſities* have done ſo. In the year 1595 one Mr *Barret* of *Caius* College in *Cambridge* preaching in the Univerſity Church called St *Maries* adventured on an Invective againſt the Doctrines of *Predeſtination* and *Perſeverance*. This Sermon, tho' preached in *Latine*, and which therefore cou'd not much affect the Vulgar, yet inſtantly gave the Alarm to the Univerſity. The heads

[a] See *Burnet's* Expoſ. P. 8. [b] Sermon on Falſe Brethren. p. [mihi] 11. 15.
* *Burnet* Ubi Supra p. 151. 152.

heads of the Several Houſes *viz.* Dr. *Some*, Dr. *Duport*, Dr. *Goad* Dr. *Tindall*, Dr. *Whitakers*, Dr. *Barwell*, Dr. *Jegom*, Dr *Preſton*, Mr. *Chadderton*, and Mr. *Clayton* preſently met upon it, and upon Mature Deliberation and Advice, by their *unanimous* Vote adjudged Mr. *Barret* to recant his Aſſertions as *falſe, erroneous* and manifeſtly repugnant to the Religion received and eſtabliſhed in the Church of *England* by publick and lawful Authority. This was a very bitter Pill to Mr *Barret*; yet either his Stomach or His Conſcience prevailed with Him to give it Throat. Accordingly, upon the 10th of *May* in the ſaid Year, He appeared in the *Univerſity* Church where he had offended, and made a fair *Recantation*. The Sermon is ſtill extant in Print, and I ſhall beg Leave to give one Note of it. 'Theſe Words, *ſaith* 'He, eſcaped Me, viz. *As for thoſe that are not ſaved, I do moſt* 'ſtrongly believe, and do freely proteſt that I am ſo perſwaded againſt Cal-'vin, Peter Martyr, and the reſt, that Sin is the true, proper, and firſt Cauſe 'of Reprobation. But now being better inſtructed; I ſay, that the 'Reprobation of the Wicked is from everlaſting, and that that Say-'ing of *Auguſtine* to *Simplician* is moſt true viz. *If Sin were the Cauſe* 'of Reprobation, then no Man ſhould be elected, becauſe God doth foreknow 'all Men to be defiled with it. And (that I may ſpeak freely) I am 'of the ſame Mind; and do believe concerning the Doctrine of E-'lection and Reprobation, as the Church of *England* believeth and 'teacheth in the Book of the *Articles of Faith*, in the Article of Pre-'deſtination.--- And I acknowledg, that by the Vertue of the Prayer 'of Chriſt, every true Believer is ſo ſtayed up, that his Faith *cannot* 'fail.--- So that He which *once* hath this Faith ſhall *ever* have it. Thus Mr *Barret*. The whole Sermon is worthy Mr *Rhind*'s peruſal: For I have the Charity to wiſh that He may one Day have Uſe for it.

Secondly, The Supream *Eccleſiaſtical Governours* of the Church have declared yet more poſitively for theſe Doctrines. Upon the 20th of *November* in the ſaid Year 1595 they met at *Lambeth* and framed the famous Nine *Lambeth* Articles, which are as follows

The *Nine* Assertions or Articles of *Lambbeth*, composed and agreed upon at *Lambbeth* House on the 20 Day of *November*, in the yeere of our Lord 1595 by *John* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, *Richard* Bishop of *London* *Richard* elect Bishop of *Bangor*, and sundry other Reverend and Learned Divines there present.

1. GOD from Eternity hath Predestinated *certain* Men unto Life; *certain* Men he hath Reprobated unto Death.
2. The moving or efficient Cause of Predestination unto Life, is not the Foresight of Faith, or of Perseverance, or of good Works, or of *any* Thing that is in the Persons Predestinated, but *only* in the Will of the well pleased God.
3. There is a *definite* and *certain* Number of the Predestinate which can neither be Augmented nor diminished.
4. Those who are not Predestinated to Salvation shall be *necessarly* Damned for their sins.
5. A true, living and justifying Faith and the Spirit of God justifying is not extinguished, it falleth not away, it vanisheth not away in the Elect either *finally* or *totally*.
6. A Man truly faithfull, that is, such a one who is endued with a justifying Faith, is certain with the full Assurance of Faith, of the Remission of his Sins, and of his Everlasting Salvation by Christ.
7. Saving Grace is not given, is not communicated, is not granted to *all* Men by which they may be saved if they will.
8. No Man *can* come unto Christ, unless it shall be given unto Him; and unless the Father shall draw him: And all Men are not drawn by the Father, that they may come to the Son.
9. It is not in the Will or Power of every one to be saved.

Thus far the *Lambeth* Articles. And this was as plain going to Work as one cou'd wish.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, The *Court* was not behind with the Church. When afterwards *Arminianism* prevailed in the *United Provinces*, and had caused terrible Convulsions, K. *James* VI was aware of the Danger the *British* Dominions were in. He was a Prince very well seen in the *Roman* Classicks, and no doubt had read the

..... Jam proximus ardet
Ucalegon.---

And therefore thought it reasonable to bestirr Himself to prevent the spreading of the Flame. For this Purpose He sent over his Ambassadour Sir *Dudly Carlton* to perswade the *States* to provide some Remedy and to smother the Sparks which might set Him on Fire. Sir *Dudly* upon the 6 of *October* 1617 attended their *High-Mightinesses* assembled at the *Hague*, and delivered Himself in a most elaborate Speech, wherein He declares the Doctrine impugned by *Arminius* to be the *true* and ancient Doctrine, and to have been received and authorized by the common Consent of *all* the Reformed Churches; and that the *Schism* which prevail'd within the Church, and the *Faction* in the State were *both* owing to *Arminius*. I hope none will deny that Sir *Dudly* had His Great Master's Allowance for saying all this (*c*). And upon the whole He solicits them to call a *Synod* for determining the controverted Points.

Fourthly, The *English Delegates* to forreign Synods, have declared the same Way. Upon the foresaid Solicitation the Synod of *Dort* met, and was assisted by Divines from the Church of *England*: And in the said Synod such Conclusions were made upon the *five Articles*, as I need not tell any Body, are the very same with the Doctrines contain'd in the *Westminster* Confession, maintained by the *Scots* Presbyterians, and now impugned by Mr *Rhind* and the Men of his Kidney (*d*). Somewhile after the Return of these Delegates from the Synod, they were attaqued by a certain Scribler on their Conduct and the Doctrinal Conclusions they had gone in to. They thought it necessary to defend themselves, and accordingly wrote A JOINT ATTESTATION (*e*), whereof take the last Words. 'Whatsoever there was assented unto and subscribed by us concerning the *five Articles* either in the Joint Synodical Judgment, or in our particular

[c] See the Speech it self set forth by Authority, London printed by William Jones. 1618. [d] Vide Acta Synod. Dordrac. (e) London printed by M. Fletcher.

particular Collegiate Suffrage (ſtyled in the Acts of the Synod *Theologorum Magnæ Britanniæ Sententia*, and at large extant there) is not only warrantable by the Holy Scriptures, but alſo conformable to the *received* Doctrine of our ſaid venerable Mother. Which we are ready to maintain, and juſtifie againſt all Gainſayers, whenſoever we ſhall be thereunto called by lawfull Authority. *Ita atteſtamur.*

GEORGIUS *Ciceſtrienſis Epiſcopus*
JOHANNES *Sarisburienſis Epiſcopus.*
Gualterus Balcanquall *Decan. Roff.*
Samuel Ward *Pub. Profeſs. Theol. in Acad. Cant. & Coll. Sid. Præfect.*
Thomas Goad *Sacræ Theol. Doctor.*

I hope all this is more than ſufficient to prove that the Doctrines impugned by Mr. *Rhind*, as *fundamentally falſe and pernicious*, are the Doctrines of the Church of *England*, and that they are not only *Articles of Peace*, but *Articles of Faith too.* Think then what a wiſe Part He has acted in ſeparating from the *Presbyterians* upon the Account of theſe Articles, and joining the Church of *England*, which has expreſly declared ſuch as affirm them to be *in any Part erroneous* to be Excommunicated *ipſo Facto* (*f*). So much for the Church of *England.*

IV. Theſe Doctrines are the Doctrines of the *Catholick* Church of Chriſt, which has alſo declared, that ſuch as oppoſe them are worthy of an *Anathema.* What Method ſhall I take to prove this? Shall I go through the ſeveral Authors in the ſeveral Ages? That were too tedious. But, which will be equally ſufficient, I ſhall prove it from the Account of one who was *Epiſcopalian* Himſelf, a *Scots* Man too, and who was inferiour to none in Theological Abilities, and is held in the greateſt Veneration by all of the *Epiſcopal* Communion. The Perſon I mean, is Dr *John Forbes* a *Corſe* Divinity Profeſſor at *Aberdeen*, I ſhall prove it from His *Inſtructiones Hiſtorico Theologicæ*, a Work, which, to give Biſhop *Burnet*'s Character of it (*g*), 'If 'He had been ſuffered to enjoy the Privacies of His Retirement and 'Study to give us the *Second* Volume, had been the greateſt Treaſure 'of Theological Learning that perhaps the World has yet ſeen. The whole *Eight* Book of the foreſaid Work is written on Purpoſe, to ſhew that theſe Doctrines, which Mr. *Rhind* has impugned, were the Doctrines

[f] Canon V. 1603. [g] Preface to His Life of Dr Beddell.

Doctrines of the *Catholick* Church of Christ, and to answer the Objections of the *Palagians* and *Semi-Pelagians* against them; which Objections are the very same with those Mr. *Rhind* has advanced. He has comprehended the Sum of the Controversy in the XII *Chapter* of his said VIII Book in *seven* Questions, in which he runs the Difference betwixt the Faith of the *Catholick* Church and the Opinions of the foresaid *Heretick*s. These Questions will set the whole Matter in a true Light, and they are as follows

1. *Quest.* Whether are the foreseen good Things of those who are Elected, their Will and Faith and good Works and Perseverance in them, or any of these Things the *Cause* for which they are Elected, or a *Condition* prerequisite in those that were to be Elected? Or whether all those Things in the Elect are the *Effects* of Election and Predestination? The *Semi-Pelagians* affirmed the First, and denyed the Latter. But the CATHOLICKS denyed the first and affirmed the latter.

2. *Q.* Whether is not the Number of the Elect and of Men Predestinated by God to Grace and Glory from Eternity, *definite* and *determined*: So that of them *none* shall perish, and besides them *none* shall be saved? The *Semi-Pelagians* denyed it. The CATHOLICKS affirmed it.

3. *Q.* Whether hath God from Eternity Predestinated some to Evil? The *Semi Pelagians* utterly deny that any Man was Predestinated either to Sin or to Destruction. The CATHOLICKS distinguished, and denyed that any Man was Predestinated to *Sin*, but affirmed that they were Predestinated to *Punishment*.

4. *Q.* Whether of the Reprobate did God find the Demerits more and worse than of those whom he Elected, and *therefore* Reprobated the former and Predestinated them to Destruction, and Elected the latter and Predestinated them to Life Eternal? Or whether he did not find them both *equal* in their Demerits and worthy of eternal Death? The *Semi-Pelagians* affirmed the first. The CATHOLICKS affirmed the latter.

5. *Q.* Whether, of this Difference or Discrimination whereby some are Predestinated to Life Eternal, there be *any* other Cause assigned in the Scripture, besides the most free Will of God, *who hath Mercy upon whom He will have Mercy, and hardneth whom He will*;

will; and if it be *Lawfull* for us to ſearch for *any* other Cauſe? The *Semi-Pelagians* affirmed it. The CATHOLICKS denyed it.

6. *Q.* Whether does this Doctrine of the CATHOLICKS attribute either *Injuſtice* or *Cruelty* to God, or render Exhortations, Prayers and the Study of Piety uſeleſs to Men? The *Semi-Pelagians* affirmed it. The CATHOLICKS denyed it.

7. *Q.* Whether, ſuppoſing this Doctrine of the CATHOLICKS true, is it expedient to Preach it openly and in earneſt to the people? The *Semi Pelagians* denyed it. But the CATHOLICKS affirmed that it was to be preached openly and in earneſt, yet prudently and ſeaſonably as all Divine Myſteries ought to be, and with a right dividing of the Word of Truth.

Thus far that great Man. And in confirming theſe *Catholick* Doctrines He employs the reſt of the ſaid Book: And does it mainly from the Teſtimonies of the Fathers, in which no Man was better ſeen. And, to crown all, in the IV *Chapter* of the ſaid VIII Book He declares, that the contrary Doctrines were, by *Maxentius*, *Petrus Diaconus* and the whole *eaſtern* Churches with him: By *Fulgentius* and the *African* Biſhops: And by the European *Weſtern* Churches, Judged HERETICAL, deſtructivly alien from the CATHOLICK Senſe, and worthy of an ANATHEMA in caſe of Obſtinacy in them.

And now what melancholy Reflections muſt Mr *Rhind* make, when he conſiders that, as by the former Part of his Book he made Himſelf a *Schiſmatick* ſo by this part of it, he has made himſelf a moſt groſs *Heretick*? When he conſiders that Mr *Dodwell* himſelf has given him the Lye, and that the whole *Forreign* Reformed Churches, our *Scotch* Epiſcopalians, the Church of *England*, and the *Catholick* Church of Chriſt have all of 'em declared for theſe Doctrines which he has rejected as *fundamentally falſe and pernicious*: And when he finds himſelf, by the Judgment of the *Catholick* Church through the world, enrolled amongſt the worſt of *Hereticks*, pronounced worthy of an ANATHEMA, and ſtanding *de facto* excommunicated by the Church of *England*!

That I may conclude. I have *heard* indeed (tho' I think it but a *Fable*) of a Proteſtant Church ſomewhere on this ſide *Nova Zembla*; though I cannot now name the preciſe Bearing of the Place, where *Nothing*

Nothing is required in Law to qualify a Clergy-Man, but that He do not openly deny or impugn the Doctrine of the Trinity. Though He does not believe *that*, and tho' He publickly impugn *all* the other Articles of Christianity, it is Nothing. I grant Mr *Rhind* might serve for a *Priest* under such a *Constitution*: But how He can be capable to serve as such in *Britain* is more than I understand. But let those who put Him into Orders look to that. I proceed.

CHAP. IV.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Third Reason for Separating from the Presbyterians viz.* that their Worship is chargeable with *fundamental* Corruptions and Defects as to the *Matter*, and that it is very *Imperfect* as to the *Manner*, *is examined. From* P. 148, *to* P. 185.

THIS Mr *Rhind* asserts p 149. And if it appear he has proved it, I shall own his *Separation* was Just. Imperfections we acknowledge, as I think all Mankind ought to do, even in our best Performances. But *fundamental* Corruptions & Defects we refuse, & want to find them proved against us. In the mean Time, to se-

parate from the *Scots* Worſhip, becauſe of its *Corruption*; and to go over to the *Engliſh* Worſhip as *purer*, looks ſo very like a Jeſt, that for my Heart I cannot but ſmile at it, as I am ſure five hundred others have done before Me, and twice as many, 'tis likely, will do after Me.

Mr *Rhind* eſſays the Proof of His Charge in two Particulars viz. *Prayers* and *Sacraments*. I ſhall diſtinctly conſider what He has advanced on each.

SECT. I.

Wherein Mr Rhind's *Exceptions againſt the Presbyterian's* Prayers *are examined. From* P. 149 *to* P. 177.

AGAINST theſe he excepts *two* Things I. That the *Matter* of them is Corrupt and Defective. II. That the *Manner* of them is ſo far from being the beſt, that it is very Imperfect. His *Proof* of theſe Exceptions I ſhall conſider in ſo many *Articles*.

ARTICLE I.

Wherein Mr Rhind's *Proofs, That the* Matter *of the Presbyterians* Prayers *is Corrupt and Defective, are Conſidered. From* P. 149 *to* P. 156.

FOR making good this Charge *Firſt*, He argues, that it *muſt* be ſo. *Secondly*, He makes an Induction of the Particulars wherein it *is* ſo.

Firſt,

First, He argues that it *must* be so. 'If, *saith He* p. 149, their 'Doctrine be Corrupt, so must their *Worship* be too; because the Doctrines, which are the common Subjects of their *Sermons*, do likewise constitute the Substance of their *Prayers*. The Answer is easie. I have proved in the preceeding *Chapter*, that these Doctrines, which he charges as *Corrupt*, are the Doctrines of the *Catholick* Church of Christ, believed by every Christian, long before the Upstart Sect of the *High Flyers* was heard of in the World. Therefore the *Prayers* which are formed agreeably to these *Doctrines* can not be Corrupt. Suppose now I had been Preaching the Doctrine of *Absolute Election:* After Sermon I break out into a Prayer to this Purpose.

O GOD We thank thee that Thou hast Predestinated Us unto the Adoption of Children by Jesus Christ to thy Self, according to the Good pleasure of thy Will, to the Praise and Glory of thy Grace, whereby Thou hast made us accepted in the Beloved; & hast from the Beginning chosen us to Salvation through Sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the Truth. Thou mightest have designed Us for Vessels of Wrath, as Thou didst the fallen Angels, and then we had been eternally undone without all possible Remedy. There was Nothing in us to move Thee when we lay all together in the general heap of Mankind. It was Thy own *free* Grace and Bounty, that made Thee to take Delight in us, *to chuse us from the Rest*, and to severe us from these many Thousands in the World who shall perish everlastingly. Give us Grace we beseech Thee, that we may give all Diligence to make our Calling and Election sure----?

This Prayer is exactly formed upon the Scheme of the *Irrespective Decrees*. But is there any thing in it which any Christian may not join with? Mr *Rhind* must needs say there is. In the mean Time I must tell him, I was taught it by *Wilkins* Bishop of *Chester* (*h*) who shou'd have known what was Sound what Corrupt Doctrine, at least as well as Mr *Rhind*.

Secondly, He makes an Induction of the particulars wherein the Presbyterian's *Prayers* are Corrupt or Defective. Which take as follows in *Ten* particulars.

[h] Gift of Prayer Chap. XXVIII. Eighth Edit.

1. *They pray*, saith He p. 150, *for the Continuance of* Presbyterian *Government, and bleſs God for the Extirpation of, and beſeech him to preſerve this Nation from* Prelacy. But I have already proved that *Presbytry* is of Divine Inſtitution, and that *Prelacy* is without all Scripture Warrant. Therefore ſuch *Prayers* are ſo far from being a *Corruption*, that they are a *Duty*, even as much a Duty as it is to pray, that *every Plant which our Heavenly Father hath not planted may be rooted up.*

2. *They thank God*, ſaith he *Ibid*, *for continuing the* Presbyterian *Doctrine.* But this I have proved to be the Doctrine of the Goſpel, and believed by all the Chriſtian Church. It were therefore the worſt Ingratitude not to thank God for the Continuance of it.

3. *They never omit*, ſaith he *ibid, in their Publick Prayers to ask a Bleſſing upon the Word that is to be, or has been Preached.* 'Tis true we do ſo, and let him make his worſt of it. And when he gets a new Revelation to prove the Word which we *Preach* to be *Impious* and *Falſe*, we beg he may let us hear of it.

4. *They bleſs God*, ſaith he *ibid*, for, *and entreat him to continue the* Purity *of their* Worſhip. 'Tis true we do ſo, and I hope God ſhall hear us. But it was too ſoon for him to *aſſert* it to be Corrupt, before he had *proved* it to be ſo. This is the Thing they call *Begging the Queſtion*, or, which is worſe, *proving a Thing by it Self.* The Presbyterian Worſhip is Corrupt, becauſe it is Corrupt! A very handſome Way of Diſcourſing, and no doubt very convinceing!

5. *They pray*, ſaith he p. 151, *that God may ſtop the Progreſs of the* Engliſh *Liturgy.* Anſ. *Amen*, even ſo be it. But why cou'd not Mr. *Rhind* join in ſuch a *Prayer?* Why, he cou'd not do it *without offending God, it being the moſt excellent of all others.* I ſhall not ſay what it may be in its *Nature*, but ſure I am it has not proved ſuch in its *Conſequences*: For, ſince ever there were *Liturgies* in the World, never any of 'em, no not all of 'em together have occaſioned ſo much Strife and Diviſion, ſo much War and Blood-ſhed, as that has done. But he gives another Reaſon why he could not join in ſuch a *Prayer*, which is indeed a very notable one. I could not do it, ſaith he, *without Treaſon againſt the Queen, it being that which*

which her Majesty Practises, and has authorized (*tolerated* he shou'd have said) *the Exercise of, to those of the* Episcopal *Persuasion in* Scotland. Now I ask. 1*st*, When was the Law made which makes it *Treason* to pray against the Progress of the *English* Liturgy. I don't think there is any Thing *Treason*, but what the Law has declared to be such. Pray, Good Mr. *Rhind*, cite the Law in your next, that we may be aware of our Danger. 2*dly*, May not one with a very good Conscience both pray against and practise contrary to what the Prince practises. I suppose the Apostle *Paul* did both in his Time, and I suppose the Church of *England* Her self did so in the Time of the late K. *James*. Mr. *Hobbes* indeed was a very Learned Man who made the King's Conscience the Standard for the Consciences of all his Subjects, just as the great Clock rules all the lesser Clocks in Town; yet that Gentleman's Principles have not been always well spoken of: But it seems Mr. *Rhind* intends to revive them. 3*dly*, Has not her Majesty and the *Parliament* Authorized the *Presbyterian* Government and Worship? And yet do not the *Episcopal* Clergy in their Conventicles every Day both pray and preach against the same, and that without any Fear of *Treason*? 4*thly*, If the *Scots* Episcopal Ministers are so chary of *Treason* against the Queen, why don't they so much as pray for her? Why do they skip over that part of the *Liturgy* which is designed for Her? 'Tis notourly known that the Generality of 'em do this.

6. *They pray*, saith he *ibid*, *for a Blessing upon their Kirk Judicatories in the Exercise of their Discipline, which, in many Instances, I knew to be scandalously partial, and highly Unjust.* Well. Let us hear one of these Instances? No. He may perhaps give you that in the next Edition. But his Business in this was to *Assert*. Mr. *Rhind* pretends to have gone over to the Church of *England*. What is the Character of *Her* Ecclesiastical Courts? It wou'd perhaps be thought Ill-Nature in Me to give one; but let us hear the Noble Historian *Clarendon* who has saved my Pains to purpose. ' I never ' yet, *saith He* (*i*), spoke with *one* Clergy Man, who hath had the ' Experience of both Litigations, that hath not ingenuously confessed

[*i*] Vol. I. B. IV. p. 242.

'feſſed, he had rather, in reſpect of his Trouble, charge, and Sa-'tisfaction to his Undeſtanding, have *three* Suits depending in *Weſt-'minſter* Hall, than *one* in the *Arches*, or *any* Eccleſiaſtical Court. Now tho' Mr. *Rhind* cou'd not pray for a Bleſſing on the *Kirk* Judicatories, yet may he not, after this, with great Freedom pray for one upon the *Church* Judicatories? I'm ſure they have much need of Prayers.

7. *They do not*, ſaies he p. 151,152, *pray for the Forgiveneſs of their Enemies.* And he is ſo high upon this, that he aſſerts, *During the 22 Years I was among them, I don't Remember that ever I heard* one *of them (and I have heard ſome Hundreds) preſs it as a* Duty, *or once offer it* a Petition *to Almighty God.* I wiſh Mr *Rhind* had given us ſome better Teſtimony than his own; But ſeeing he has contented himſelf with it, I think it may be enough to lay Mine in the Ballance againſt it: But then I ſhall qualifie it, that it may be enquired into. I have very ſeldom Occaſion to hear others preach. I am now writing this upon the *Eleventh* day of *November* 1713. The laſt Sermon I heard preached by another was upon *Thurſday* the 22 of *October* laſt. It was preached by Mr *Alexander Muir* Miniſter of *Rutherglen* in the High Church of *Glaſgow* in that Part of it commonly called the *Inner-Kirk* before a Numerous Audience upon Rev. III. 15. 16. I declare I never conferred with him upon the Subject of *Forgiveneſs of Enemies*, either before or ſince; and that he knows Nothing of my intending to publiſh this Paſſage. He is known to be a Zealous *Presbyterian*, and always was ſo. And now after all theſe Circumſtances I declare, and I appeal to the Audience for the Verity of it, 'that I heard him after Sermon pray in Terms *That God would forgive our Enemies.* This I hope is ſome better than Mr *Rhind*'s Negative, and I pitched on this Inſtance, only becauſe it was at the laſt Sermon I heard. For tho' as I ſaid, I have rarely Occaſion to hear Sermon from others, yet when ever I chance to be aſſiſtant at the Communion any where, I always hear *all Perſons having Malice* ſolemnly debarred the Lord's Table, and ſolemn Prayer put up to God for the *Forgiveneſs of Enemies.* But enough of this, we may poſſibly hear more of it afterwards.

8. *They pray*, ſaith he p. 152, *for the Deſtruction of their Enemies.* How! Of their *Perſonal* Enemies? If ſo, 'tis a very great Crime; and we want

want to have the Criminals named, and the Vouchers adduced. Has he done this? No. But, saith he, *I am ready to do it.* Was he in so great haste that he cou'd not stay to give so much as *one* Instance? Gentlemen of the *Episcopal* Perswasion who have adopted and cherish-ed this Book of Mr *Rhind*'s, I appeal to you upon your Honour, Sense and Conscience, whether this was a rational Way of Writing; and whether it is not scandalous in the last Degree to approve of it. *'Tis true*, saith Mr *Rhind*, *they pretend to do this, becaus these against whom they pray, are Enemies to Truth, and Persecutors of its Professors*; Very well! And if that *Pretence* be true, are they not just in doing so? No, saith he, no *Pretence can excuse the Impiety of it.* Strange! Are there not innumerable Precedents for it in Scripture? When God has promised to *consume the Man of Sin with the Spirit of his Mouth, and to destroy him with the Brightness of His coming* II Thes. II. 8. Is it not lawfull, nay is it not a Duty to turn this Promise into a Prayer? To come yet a little nearer, did Mr *Rhind* never hear of an Address made by the *Scots* Prelates to the late K. *James*, wherein they prayed that God would give him *the Hearts of his Subjects, and the Necks of his Enemies (k).* Was not this to pray for the Destruction of Enemies in good Earnest? And can any *Pretence* excuse the Impiety of it?

But Mr *Rhind* had a secret powerful Reason for insisting on this Topick, as will appear by his Enlargement on it. He alledges that this Pretence and Practice of the Presbyterians argues the most *scandalous Partiality* and *vilest Hypocrisy.* Pray how? 'Why, *saith He*, 'at the same Time that they pray for the Destruction of *some*, upon 'Pretence that they persecute the Servants of God; They imme-'diately offer up their most fervent Addresses for the Prosperity 'of *others* who are no less Persecutors, and neglect to offer up one 'Petition for a *third Sort* who have signalized themselves in Behalf of 'such as suffer for Righteousness Sake. I doubt not but several Readers may want a Key to this fine Harangue, but I believe I can supply them. By the *some*, whose Destruction the Presbyteri-ans pray for, upon *Pretence* that they persecute the Servants of God, He means the *French* King. By the *others* no less Persecutors whose prosperity the Presbyterians pray for, He means the House of *Au-stria*,

[k] See *London* Gazette Numb. 2398. An. 1688.

ſtria, the Duke of *Savoy* and ſuch other Popiſh Confederates in the late War. By the *Third Sort* whom the Presbyterians neglect to pray for, notwithſtanding they have ſignalized themſelves in Behalf of ſuch as ſuffer for Righteouſneſs Sake, he means the King of *Sweden*, who piouſly gave Diverſion to the *Allies* in Behalf of the *French* King: And no doubt the Presbyterians were very Guilty in not praying to God for Succeſs to him in ſo laudable a Service. And now, Good Reader, you have Mr *Rhind's* heart, and an account of that which, beyond peradventure, he cou'd leaſt of all others digeſt in the Presbyterian Devotions. His Book bears Date in the *Preface*. 6th *December* 1712, that is about half a Year e're the Peace was concluded. It was then an Unpardonable Crime in the Presbyterians to pray for the *Queen* and her *Allies*, whereas they ſhou'd have prayed for the *French* King and his Aſſiſtants. I believe there is no Man that knows any thing of the Hiſtory of *Lewis's* Reign, but knows too, that *Nero*, *Domitian* and *Diocleſian* were Merciſull Princes in Compariſon of him; and therefore ſuch as wou'd alleviate his Tyranny and Perſecution by calling the Imputation of it a *Pretence* ought no otherwiſe to be look'd on than as avowed Enemies to the Reformed Intereſt. And tho' many in *Britain* and *Ireland* are now bewitched with a Spirit of Infatuation in Favours of that Tyrant, yet I hope they may one Day have their Eyes opened to ſee both their Wickedneſs and their Folly. I pray God it be not too late, and at the Expence both of our Religion and Liberties. But now as to the Buſineſs of the *Prayers*. How often did Her Majeſty declare from the Throne, that the reducing the *French* Power was neceſſary for ſecuring, not only the Proteſtant Religion, but the Liberties of *Europe* too? And was it not lawfull to pray for Succeſs to thoſe who joined with Her Majeſty in ſo good a Work? And muſt not every good Man in the three Nations have been ſenſible of this? Becauſe the People of Mr *Rhind's* Kidney are content to barter Religion, Liberty, and all the moſt valuable Intereſts of Mankind, for the dear Enjoyments of Slavery and Superſtition; was it needful that the Reſt of the Nation ſhou'd run mad with them? 'Tis true the Houſe of *Auſtria*, *Savoy* &c perſecuted the Proteſtants in *Hungary*, *Bohemia*, *Piemont* and perhaps with little leſs Fury than the *French* King did his Subjects. But it is as true that the Presbyterians prayed for the Perſecuted

in

in these Places, and against their Persecutors, so far as concerned the Matter of Religion, in the same Terms that they prayed for the persecuted in *France* and against the *French* King. And 'tis true also they blessed God for any Freedom was procured to the Protestants, whether by the King of *Sueden* or any other. But still they prayed against the *French* King, and so did the Church of *England.* For did not Her Majesty order Forms of prayer and Thanksgiving, to be composed by the Bishops at the Opening and Ending of each Campaign, for Success against him? Nay did not the Clergy by Direction of the *Liturgy* (*l*) pray every day during the War that God wou'd *abate the pride of their Enemies, asswage their Malice, and* CONFOUND *their Devices*? And did ever the Presbyterians pray against the *French* King or any Body else in harsher Terms? And is it not the Duty of every good Christian to pray for the Destruction of the Power of one who, besides his bloody Enmity to the Reformed Interest, is notourly known to be an Oppressor of the Liberties of Mankind? Add to all this, that to my certain Knowledg the Presbyterians usually pray; that, if it be Possible, God wou'd give him Repentance, which I hope is a kinder Office done to him, than to justifie his unparalleled Wickedness, as some others do.

9. He Objects p 154. 'That they offer up many *Nonsensical* petitions to God, commit many *Blunders* and *Tautologies*, transgress the 'most fundamental Rules of *Grammar*, *Rhetorick* and *Logick*. Well, how does he prove all this? You are not to ask that; he CAN do it, and that must stand for as good as if he had done it. But how *can* he do it? Why, 'the Expence of a Shilling, *saith he*, will procure 'from some short Hand Writer a Copy of one of their Prayers at 'some of their Weekly Lectures in *Edinburgh*, where one wou'd suppose their Men of best Sense did officiate. But why wou'd he hazard his being branded as a *Malicious Slanderer*, rather than go to the Expence of a Shilling? However nigardly he is of his Purse, it seems he is abundantly prodigal of his Fame. Besides, when he has published *one* such Prayer, I hope no Man in his Wits wou'd sustain that as a just Exception against the *whole* Communion. There

[l] See Prayer in the Time of War and Tumults.

are no Doubt weak Men among the Presbyterians. But does not the same Objection ly against every other Society, tho' against none so much, that I can hear of, through the broad World, as against the *English* Inferiour Clergy? 'The *much greater* Part of those (as the 'Bishop of *Sarum* told us last Year about this same Time) (*m*) who 'come to be ordain'd are *ignorant* to a Degree, not to be apprehended 'by those who are not obliged to know it. The easiest Part of 'Knowledg is that to which they are the greatest Strangers; I mean 'the plainest Parts of the Scriptures, which they say, in Excuse of their '*Ignorance*, that their Tutors in the Universities never mention the read-'ing of to them, so that they can give *no* Account, or at least a *very Im-'perfect* one, of the Contents even of the *Gospels*. Those who have 'read *some few* Books, yet never seem to have read the *Scriptures*. '*Many* cannot give a *tolerable* Account even of the *Catechism* it self, 'how short and plain soever. They cry and think it a sad Disgrace 'to be denyed Orders, tho' the *Ignorance* of some is such, that in a 'well regulated State of Things, they wou'd appear not knowing 'enough to be admitted to the Holy Sacrament. This does often tear 'my Heart. The Case is not much better in *many*, who having 'got into Orders come for Institution, and cannot make it appear 'that they have read the *Scriptures* or any *one* good Book since they 'were ordained, so that the *small* Measure of Knowledg upon which 'They got into Holy Orders not being improved, is in a Way to be '*quite* lost. Thus far Bishop *Burnet*. I hope this is some better Testimony than a Copy of a Prayer, not yet delivered, from some Short Hand Writer.

After all this, to make Mr *Rhind* easie, I shall ingenuosly confess how far his Charge may be true against the Presbyterian Ministers. Neither these of 'em at *Edinburgh*, nor any of 'em elsewhere are fond of that which *Tillotson* calls *Rumbling Rhetorick* alias *Bombast*: Nor are they carefull to make their Sentences run like Blank Verse, or fall into a Musical Cadence, as if they were just come from reading an *English* Tragedy. They don't affect the *English* Accent without the *English* Phrase: Nor do they aspire to have their Language Soaring in the Clouds, and their Thoughts mean while creeping on the Flat. No, they think it sufficient to deliver themselves in plain *Scotch*, without

[m] Preface to the Fourth Edition of his Pastoral Care.

without Flights of Fancy or Points and Turns of Wit; being sensible that such Things are both unsuitable to the Simplicity of the Gospel; and besides, that they wou'd be thrown away on the greatest Part of their Audience. For, They don't believe that every one that wears a fine Hat or a fashionable Head-Dress is a deep Scholar. They know there are vulgar Wits under long Wigs oftimes, as well as under the Natural Hair; and within Silk Scarfs as well as coarse Plaids. And therefore, both in their Prayers and Preachings they adapt their Discourse to *Men of low Degree*; being convinced of Mr *Dryden*'s good Sense when he said

That the strait Gate wou'd be made straiter yet
Were none admitted there but Men of Wit.

All this I confess, the *Presbyterians* are guilty of; and let Mr *Rhind* improve on it as far as he ever can. The rest of the Charge we shall acknowledge after hearing Probation, which equal Judges I hope will sustain as a Relevant Dilator.

10. In the *last* Place Mr *Rhind* objects the Omission of the *Lord's Prayer*. He does indeed bring in this Objection in his Arguings against the MANNER of our Prayers; and there we shall consider it as an Argument for *Forms*. But he insists upon it likewise as a fundamental *Defect*; and therefore I shall consider it here while treating of the *Matter* of our Prayers. Now take the Objection in his own Words P. 164. 'If, *saith he*, the Lord's Prayer be a 'Form, which when we pray we are commanded to use; and if the 'Presbyterians *totally* neglect to use it as such, I appeal to the Reader, whether they are not chargeable with an *Impious* and *fundamental* Omission; and in Consequence, whether all who would not 'be involved in the Guilt, or run the hazard of offering up an unacceptable, because an Imperfect Worship, *should* not separate 'from them. Thus He. For Answer

The Judgment of a Church is to be gathered from her publick *Formula's*. Now in all these the Presbyterians own it lawfull to use it as a Prayer. The *lesser* Catechism calls it a *Form*. The *larger* Catechism saies *it may be used as a Prayer*. The *Directory* recommends it to *be* used as such. The *General Assembly* 1705 recommends the Observation of the *Directory*. Accordingly many Ministers do use the Lord's Prayer. I my self use it sometimes, my next Neighbour Minister does the same. His next Neighbour (both

of 'em Genuine *Presbyterians*) uſes it every Lord's Day. The like do others in ſeveral parts of the Nation. 'Tis therefore falſe what Mr *Rhind* affirms, that the *Presbyterians totally* neglect to uſe it even in the very Words thereof. But then, to make the Omiſſion of it an *Impious* and *Fundamental* Defect, and a *neceſſary* Cauſe of Separation is an uncommon Stretch which hardly any Man wou'd have ventured on, who has Modeſty enough to ſtick at any Thing. And therefore I muſt crave Leave to reaſon this Matter ſomewhat particularly with Mr *Rhind*. And

In the *Firſt* Place I ask. Is Mr *Rhind* or any of his party ſure that the Lord's Prayer was not *mainly* intended as a *Pattern* rather than a *Form*. Their Confidence will indeed bear them out to aſſert any Thing: Yet *Grotius*, one of the moſt Judicious Criticks the World has yet known, has expreſly ſaid upon the *Place*, 'That 'Chriſt did not command the WORDS to be recited. But that we 'ſhould take the Materials of our Prayers thence: And He gives this Solid Reaſon for it, 'That tho' it may be uſed with great 'Profit as a Form or in the very Words, yet we don't read 'that ever the Apoſtles uſed it ſo. Now let us hear what Mr. *Rhind* has advanced to prove it a *Form*. 1*ſt*, 'That it is a Form 'of prayer, *ſaith he*, is hence evident, becauſe it is conceived in 'the ſame Manner as other prayers, that is, with Invocation, Pe-'titions, Doxology and concluding *Amen*. I anſwer it has all theſe parts in *Matthew*; but it was twice preſcribed upon different Occaſions, and ſo ſaith *Joſeph Mede* himſelf upon the Subject. And when it was preſcribed in *Matthew*, 'tis plain it was deſigned *only* for a *Pattern*: For the Precept runs thus, *After this Manner therefore pray ye*. Therefore the Argument, that it is conceived *there* in the ſame Manner as other prayers, is Naught; ſeeing it was not *there* deſigned as a prayer but as a *Pattern*. 2*dly*, 'We are, *ſaith* 'Mr. *Rhind*, expreſly commanded to SAY *Our Father* &c. But 'it is Nonſenſe to command us to ſay a *Pattern*, Therefore we 'are to uſe it as a *Form*. Thus he. I anſwer, Mr. *Rhind*'s former Argument deſtroys this: For it is in *Luke*'s Goſpel that we are commanded to SAY *Our Father* &c. But in *Luke*'s Goſpel there is neither the Doxology nor the *Amen*. Therefore it is not conceived in the ſame Manner as other Prayers, in that place where

we

we are bid SAY it. Nay, *Grotius* is of the Mind that these Clauses *Which art in Heaven*, and *Thy Will be done, as in Heaven so in Earth*, and *Deliver us from Evil*, were not Originally in *Luke*'s Gospel, but crept into it out of *Matthew*'s. And he gives this Reason for it, That the first Clause *Which art in Heaven* is not extant in the old *Latine* Copies. And the Second Clause, *Thy Will be done as in Heaven so in Earth*, is neither extant in the Old *Latine* Copies, nor in some of the *Greek* Copies. And it is very false what Mr. *Rhind* alledges, that *it is Nonsense to bid us say a Pattern:* For in every Language, that I know any Thing of, there are greater *Elipses* usual than this *After this Manner* or *To this Purpose.* And so *Luke*'s Way of Speaking is very plain, *When Ye pray, Say* viz. After this Manner, or to this Purpose. Upon the whole, seeing the Lords Prayer was at least *mainly* intended for a *Pattern*, which I hope, is now tolerably evident, 'tis pretty hard to conceive how the Omission of it as a *Form* can be a *fundamental* Defect.

In the *Second* Place I ask Mr. *Rhind* and his Party, if they have not observed, that the Words of the Lord's Prayer in the Original are not the same in both Gospels. In *Matthew*'s we read δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον. In *Luke*'s δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν. In *Matthew*'s ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν. In *Luke*'s τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίεμεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν. 'Tis true, our Saviour probably did not speak in *Greek*. But when the Evangelists have varied so in their Wording of it, 'tis plain that they did not understand our Saviour as meaning to bind them up to Words and Syllables. The like Variation of phrase, which I take Notice of for the *English* Reader's Sake, is observable in our Translation. In *Matthew*'s Gospel we read *Thy Will be done in Earth as it is in Heaven.* In Luke's *Thy Will be done, as in Heaven so in Earth.* In Matthew's *Give us this Day our daily Bread.* In Luke's *Give us Day by Day our daily Bread*, and on the Margin *For the Day.* In Matthew's *Forgive us our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors.* In Luke's *Forgive us our Sins, for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us.* And which is strange enough, the *English* Liturgy varies from both: For thus it has it *Forgive us our Trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us*; and in it generally the Doxology *For thine is the Kingdom* &c is wanting. Now after all this Variety, is it to be thought that we are tyed up to the Form of Words, or that the Omission of them can be a *fundamental* Defect.

In

In the *Third* Place. I ask Mr *Rhind* and his Party, if they are sure, even supposeing it were a *Form*, that the Precept for using it was intended for PUBLICK Worship? I don't now ask if it be *lawfull* there, that is granted. But that it was not originally intended for it, I conceive to be somewhat more than probable. *1st*, Because in all the publick Ministrations related in the New Testament we never find it used. *2dly*, Because our Saviour took Occasion from discoursing on *secret* Prayer to prescribe and give the Command for it. And *3dly*, The Disciples did not *then* look upon themselves as Ministers, nor expected ever to be employed as Officers in the Church: Seeing, not only now, but even a long Time after this, yea after Christ's Resurrection, they still imagined that the *Jewish* Polity was to continue, in which those of the Family of *Levi* alone were by Divine Right Church Officers. Now if it was not originally intended for *Publick* Worship, how can the Omission of it in *Publick* Worship be a *fundamental* Defect? Especially, when we are sure, that this, which I have given, was the Sense which the primitive Church had of this Matter. For thus *Augustine* expressly declares (*n*) 'That Christ, 'in the Delivery of these Petitions, did not teach his Disciples how 'they shou'd *speak*, or what Words they shou'd use in Prayer; but 'to whom they were to pray, and what Things they were to pray 'for, when they were in the Exercise of *Secret* or *Mental* Prayer'?

In the *Fourth Place*. I ask, how can the *Episcopal* Party account for that Sense which they have given of the Precept. And how can they justifie that horrid Doctrine which they have founded it on? In the *1st* Place, They make the Sense of the Precept *When ye pray, Say*, to be, *When ye have done with your own Prayers, annex this.* This is such an Insipid Gloss, and so unheard of among the Ancients, that I admire they are not ashamed of it. We are sure that the Ancients either used it alone, or prefixed it to their Prayers when they used it. Thus *Tertullian* (*o*) after a large Commendation of the Lord's Prayer

[n] *Augustin.* de Magistro Cap. 1. *Aug.* Non te ergo movet Dominus summus Magister, cum orare doceret discipulos, verba quædam docuit, in quo nihil aliud videtur fecisse, quam docuisse quomodo in orando loqui oporteret: *AD.* Nihil me omnino istud movet: non enim verba, sed res ipsas eos verbis docuit, quibus et se ipsi commone facerent, a Quo, Quid esset orandum, cum in penetralibus, ut dictum est, mentis orarent. *Aug.* Recte intelligis.

[o] Posse nos super adjicere. Quoniam tamen Dominus prospector humanarum necessitatum seorsim post traditam orandi disciplinam, Petite, inquit, & accipietis, & sunt quæ petantur, pro Circumstantia Cujusque, præmissa legitima & ordinaria oratione quasi fundamento, accidentium jus est desiderorum. Jus est superstruendi.--- De Oratione p. 659.

Prayer adds, 'We may add thereunto; For since the Lord the Pro-'vider for all Human Necessities, has in another Place, after He 'had delivered this *Prayer*, said, *Ask and ye shall receive*: And every 'one has particular Circumstances to beg for, therefore having *pre-'mised* the lawfull and ordinary Prayer, there is place for accidental 'Requests. Thus He. But whether they prefixed it, or annexed it; they had no Opinion of the *fundamental Necessity* of doing so; an infallible Argument of which is, that we find them frequently praying without the Lord's *Prayer*, either at the Beginning or Ending of their Prayers. Thus, as Sir *Peter King* has already noted (*p*) In the Heavenly Prayer of *Polycarpus* at the Stake, The Lord's *Prayer* is neither at Beginning nor Ending. Thus *Clemens Alexandrinus* concludes his last Book of *Pædagogy*, with a *Prayer* which neither ends nor begins with the Lord's Prayer; and *Origen* (*q*) prescribing a Method of *Prayer*, speaks not a Word of the Lord's Prayer; but advises both to begin and end with Doxology, or a giving Praise to God. This they wou'd never have done, had they believed that it was fundamentally *necessary* to join the Lord's Prayer with their own. With what Reason then can our *Scots* Episcopalians make that the Sense of the Precept? But then *2dly*, The *Principle* upon which they found this Sense is a most horride one: For they assert, that the joining it with our own Imperfect Prayers renders them acceptable before God; as, on the other Hand, the Want of it makes them unacceptable. This is plain from Mr *Rhind's* Words before cited. Now what else is this but to turn that Excellent *Prayer* into an Idolatrous Charm, and to make the Repetition of it supply the Place of the Merit and Intercession of our Saviour? I ask now whether the *Presbyterian's* Omission of it, or the *Episcopalian's* Usage of it upon such a Principle be the more accountable?

To conclude this Matter. 'Tis true the *Lord's Prayer* was early used in the publick assemblies of Christians. But it was not used more than once at one Assembly: Not in *Prayers* before or after Sermon, not at all in the *Catechumen's* Office, but in the *Eucharistical* Office, and even there they did not apprehend that Christ enjoined them

[p] Enquiry into the Constitution &c of the Primitive Church, Part II. P. 28.
[q] De Oratione Sect. 22. p. 134. 135.

them to use the Words. And thus many others (*r*) both of the *Protestant* and *Roman* Communion have understood it. So much for the Exceptions against the *Matter* of the Prayers of the *Presbyterians*. Part of which Exceptions are manifestly false in *Fact*, and all the Rest of the things excepted against, Justifiable, at least as *Lawfull*, and for the most Part as *Duty*.

ARTICLE II.

Wherein Mr Rhind's *Exception against the* Manner *of the* Presbyterian's *Prayers, is considered. From P.* 156. *to P.* 177.

MR *Rhind* frequently affirms them to be *highly Imperfect* in this Respect. The only Reason he gives is, that they are performed in the *Extemporary* Way, as he expresses it. For making this a *high Imperfection*, He I. Insists upon the huge Disadvantages of it. II. Essays by Arguments to prove the Excellency, if not the Necessity, of the *Liturgick* Way.

I. He insists upon the Disadvantages of the *Extemporary* Way among the *Presbyterians*, which he lays out in *Three* particulars.

The *First* Disadvantage is, 'That a Man is discharged the use of *all* 'helps, and is desired to depend *only* upon the Motion of the Spirit 'p. 157. The Result of which is, that when one is not blessed 'with the Gift of prayer, he is tempted to neglect it altogether; or if 'he essay it once, and finds that he cannot perform it to any tole-'rable purpose, he is discouraged from any further Attempt; and so must

---

[r] *Maldonat.* in *Matth.* 6. 9. Non his necessario verbis, sed hac aut simili sententia--- nam non Apostolos orando his ipsis verbis usos fuisse legimus, aliis legimus. Neque voluit Christus, ut quotiescunque oramus, ista omnia, quæ hac oratione continentur, peteremus, sed ut omnia, aut aliqua, aut nihil certe his contrarium peterem. *Casaubon.* Exercit. 235. Christus vero non de predicatione Dei laudum agit, sed ut recte monet *Augustinus*, de modo concipiendi preces privatas. *Jansen* in *Luc.* 11. Itaque ut discere mus in oratione, non tam de verbis, quam de rebus esse anxij, ac de spiritu orationis, diversis verbis oratio nem tradidit. Vide *Clarkson* on Liturgies.

' must continue in Ignorance and Irreligion; the obtaining of which ' among the Generality of people, *saith He*, is in a great Measure ' owing to the Want of *Forms*. Or if a person grosly Ignorant ' yet adventure to pray, his performance must be crowded with ' *flat Impertinencies*, *Substantial Nonsense* and *horrid Blasphemies*, all ' which is *unavoidable* in the *Extemporary* Way. To this purpose he p. 156, 157. Is it possible Mr *Rhind* cou'd be 22 Years among the *Presbyterians*, and not know that what he has laid down for the Foundation of all this, is even a transparent Falshood. Was he not sensible that every one, that cou'd open his Eyes and read *English*, was in a Capacity to convince him of the grossest Calumny and Slander? Do the Presbyterians *Discharge the Use of all Helps* in Prayer either to Ministers or Private Christians? Was not the *Directory* for the *Publick* Worship of God compiled on purpose to give them both *Help* and *Furniture*? (*s*). Is not every Minister therein exhorted to be *carefull to furnish both his* Heart *and* Tongue *with farther and other Materials, as shall be needfull upon all Occasions*? Hath not the General Assembly given *Directions* (*t*), and suggested *Materials* for *Private* Prayer? Nay do they not expresly recommend *Forms* of prayer to the Rude and Weaker (*v*)? What meant he then to say, that they are *discharged the use of* all *helps*; *and desired to depend* only *upon the Motion of the Spirit?* Did he presume that his party were given up to *believe a Lye*? With what Confidence cou'd he impute the *Stupid Ignorance* and *Height of Impiety* to the Want of Forms? Does he not know that in *England*, where there is no Want of them, a brutal Ignorance prevails among the Vulgar, and Impieties reign, yet, I hope, unknown on this Side *Tweed*. Mr. *Rhind* has taken a great deal of Pains to represent the Gift of Prayer as an unatainable Thing. But hear Bishop *Wilkins* upon it. ' As for the pretended Difficulty of it ' *saith he* (*x*), I shall in this Discourse make it evident, that if it ' be Seriously attempted (as all Religious Businesses ought to be) ' 'tis easie to be attained by any one that has but common Capacity. And I suppose every Body who has read his Discourse is convinced he has made his Word good.

[s] See Preface to the Directory. [t] See them annexed to the Confess. of Faith. *Edinburgh* Printed by *James Watson* 1708. [v] Ibid. Sect. 9. [x] Gift of Prayer Chap. II. p. 10. 11.

The *Second* Disadvantage of *Extemporary* Prayer is the Danger, or at least the Uncertainty of the Lawfullness of Joining in it. For 'Suppose, *saith he* p. 157, a Man who is Master of a tolerable Ex-'temporary Faculty, is the Orator; yet even in that Case, before 'he begin, ye are under an Uncertainty whether what he shall 'say be Right or Wrong: This keeps the Spirit in Suspence. Per-'haps the third or fourth Petition is dubious or unsound, which ye 'cannot offer up to God. Perhaps the next ye hear is flat or Im-'pertinent, and therefore grateing to a Man of Sense. To this purpose he. Is not this a pretty Way of arguing by *Perhaps*'s? I need not spend Time upon such Chimerical Stuff. Take the Answer from Bishop *Wilkins* in the place last cited. 'Whereas, *saith* '*he*, 'tis commonly objected by some, that they cannot so well join 'in an unknown *Form* with which they are not before Hand ac-'quainted. I answer, that's an Inconsiderable Objection, and does 'oppose all Kind of *Forms* that are not publickly prescribed. As 'a Man may in his *Judgment* assent unto any Divine *Truth* de-'livered in a *Sermon*, which he never heard before; so may he 'join in his *Affections* unto any Holy *desire*, which he never heard 'before. If he who is the Mouth of the Rest, shall through Im-'prudence deliver that which we cannot approve of, God does not 'look upon it as our prayer, if our Desires do not say *Amen* to it. Thus he. And Nothing cou'd have been said more patly to the present Objection.

The *Third* Disadvantage attending *Extemporary* prayer is, 'That 'even where there is Nothing amiss in the Matter of the prayer, 'yet the Hearer cannot at once exercise that Seriousness and *In-'tention* with Respect to God, and that *Attention* which is Ne-'cessary to catch what drops from him who prays. Thus Mr. *Rhind* p. 158. But this is an Objection of the same Nature with the former; an Objection to which His own whimsical Imagination is both Father and Mother. Tho' Mr *Rhind* pretends he cannot do both at once. Yet I believe every Man else in the World finds it not only possible but easie to do. When there is Nothing amiss in the *Matter* of the Prayer, which is his Supposition, a Man must be very Glib of the Tongue, if my Thoughts cannot hold Pace with him: And the *Intensness* of my *Affections* will be

be so far from being a Hinderance, that it will be a Help to the *Attention* of my *Thoughts.*

But now are not all these Imaginary Disadvantages as frequent and as obvious in the *Liturgick* Way. For what if a Man have not a Common Prayer Book, or cannot read, or has not the Form by Heart, all which are Cases that most frequently happen? Must he not quite neglect Prayer at Home? And is it not impossible for him to exercise both *Attention* and *Intention* at once when he comes to Church? Is not the looking upon the Book and reading, a greater Diversion to the Affections than any Thing can be mention'd in the Extemporary Way? Besides, does not Mr *Rhind*, who is so well acquaint with the *Animal Oeconomy*, know, that when one is accustomed to a Form, there is the greatest Danger of falling into *Lip-Service* and *Formality*; and the greatest Difficulty in exercising either *Attention* or *Intention*? 'Tis certainly so. Every Man knows it who has tryed it; and Bishop *Wilkins* who was a great Philosopher as well as a great Divine has observed it (*y*). 'In this Case, *saith he*, 'it should be specially remembered, that in the Use of such prescript 'Forms, to which a Man hath been accustomed, he ought to be 'narrowly watchfull over his own Heart, for fear of that *Lip-Service* 'and *Formality*, which in such Cases we are more *especially* exposed 'unto. Thus He. So much for the *pretended* Disadvantages that attend *Extemporary* Prayer, which I think are pretty *real* in the *Liturgick* Way.

II. Mr. *Rhind* essays by Arguments to prove the Excellency of the *Liturgick* Way. And he argues it to be the Best. *First*, from the Nature of the Thing. *Secondly*, From Universal practice. *Thirdly*, From the Approbation of Heaven both in the Old and New Testament. *Fourthly*, From the Usage of the Primitive and Ancient Church. And *Lastly*, From the practice of the Reformed Churches. And then he concludes all with answering the Objection, that *Forms Stint the Spirit.*

First, He argues for the Excellency of the *Liturgick* Way from the Nature of the Thing p. 159, 160. *God*, saith he, *ought to be worshipped in the best Manner possible.* 'Tis granted. *A Form of Worship*, subsumes he, *which always presupposes Fore-Thought is incomparably better than the* Extemporary *Way, which requires little or none*

[*y*] Ubi Supra p. 9.

at all. Who told him that the Extemporary Way requires *little* or *no* Fore-Thought? Did ever the *Presbyterians* teach so? Have they not in their *Directory* enjoined each Minister ‘ to stirr up the ‘ Gifts of Christ in himself, and, by Meditation as well as by ob- ‘ serving the Ways of Divine providence and other Methods, to ‘ furnish himself with *Materials* of prayer? Does not every Pre- sbyterian who treats of that Subject enjoin the same? Have they ever taught otherwise than Bishop *Wilkins* himself has taught in this Case (*z*) *viz.* ‘ That generally it is both lawfull and Neces- ‘ sary to prepare our selves, as for this Gift in general, so for every ‘ particular Act of it, by premeditating, if we have Leisure for ‘ it, both Matter and Order and Words: And that tho' it be a ‘ Gift of the Spirit, yet it is not to be expected, that it shou'd sud- ‘ denly be infused into us without any precedent Endeavours of our own. Again how shall he convince us that the *Liturgick* Way *al- ways* presuppose Fore-Thought? 'Tis true it did so in the Com- pilers; but it is well enough known that it does not so in the Users. How often is it seen that while they are crying, *Be Mer- cifull to us Miserable Sinners*, they are, as a late Excellent Author hath told us, ogleing their Sweet Hearts in the next pew? And does not every Body feel it, that when they know before Hand what is to be said, they are very rarely attentive to it. But let us hear him proceed. ‘ If it be Best, *saith He*, to have the prayer formed be- ‘ fore I pronounce it, what is the Harm though I transcribe it from ‘ my Memory? None at all that I know of. *Nay*, saith He, *will I not be so much the more sure of it, if I do this*? Certainly. For *Li- tera Scripta Manet*, and the pocket is oftimes a Surer Repository than the Memory. *And if I may safely write it*, adds He, *why not* READ *it too*? I know no Reason why he may not, a Hundred Times over if he pleases. And yet 'tis very possible he may all this while not *pray* it once over: For I cannot see why *reading* a prayer, where there is no more, should be called *praying*, any more than why reading a prophesie shou'd be called *prophesying*. But now to discourse this Business of *Reading* prayers a little.

I

[z] Ubi Supra p. 11.

I ask Mr *Rhind* where does he find In the *First* place that prayers were *Read* in the primitive Church? Is there the least Vestige of it for several hundreds of years after Christ? Do not *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Cyprian*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, all tell us that the Ancient Christians in prayer lifted up their Eyes to Heaven (*a*). Does not *Chrysostome* observe from Christ's Posture in prayer expressed *John* XVII. 1. 'That thereby 'we are taught when we pray to lift up both the Eyes of Body 'and Mind? Is not the Emperor *Constantine* represented on his Coins and Medals in a Praying posture, yet not *reading* on a book, but with Eyes lift up to Heaven (*b*)? Does not *Augustine* intimate as much when he tells us upon *John* XVII. 1. *that Christ so prayed, as minding to teach us how we should pray?* Where is now the Warrant from Antiquity for *reading* prayers? 2*dly*, Is there any more Warrant for it from Scripture? Did the humble Publican, tho' in the Temple, *Read* his prayers? Or did the Pharisee pray by a *Form?* Did the Disciples, when catched in the Storm, pull out their Common-prayer Book, and read *the Forms to be used at Sea?* Did *Jonah* or the Mariners do it? Is there so much as a Whisper of this in the Bible? No indeed. A Sense of present Danger is worth Twenty Common-prayer Books; according to that known Saying *Qui nescit Orare discat Navigare, who wou'd learn to pray, let him go to Sea.*

And 'tis a plain Case, no Man wants a Prayer book who is in a Frame for praying: And he that is not in such a Frame, may indeed *Read* Prayers, but I don't think he can be said to *pray.*

But let us go on with Mr *Rhind*'s Argument. 'If that prayer, *saith he*, which I form before hand be better than that which 'I utter off hand, then certainly the Form prepared by the joint 'Endeavours of Many (allowing each of them to be neither better 'nor wiser than my self) is by great Odds preferable to my single Endeavour. Here Mr *Rhind* and I differ: For I have seldom yet observed a Composure by *several hands* so well done, as that wherein only *one* was concerned. And the Reason is evident; that, which is done by *one*, is

[a] See Sir *Peter King* Ubi Supra Part II Chap. II. Sect. 3. & *Clarkson* on Liturgies. p. 9. &c
[b] Euseb. de vita Constantini Lib. IV. Cap. 15.

is usually all of a piece; whereas that, which has many hands at the doing of it, generally makes but a linsy-woolsy kind of Stuff. Besides, tho' a prayer, formed before hand either by my self or others may be more pointed as to its Wording, and have more of a Logical Method in it; yet 'tis very possible that abrupt and independent Sentences, breaking from a Contrite Heart, and a Soul flaming with the Love of Jesus, may be more acceptable to God and more profitable to my self.

From all this Reasoning Mr. *Rhind* concludes that, *that Form which the Church has provided* (He means the *English* Liturgy) *has unspeakable Advantages above any one Man's Performance* But herein Mr. *Rhind*'s Taste and mine differ as much about the *Preference* of Forms, as our Judgments do about the *Use* of them. For I am perfectly convinced that the Devotions of the Author of the *whole Duty of Man*, or *Symon Patrick*'s Devotions, or *Jeremy Taylor*'s Devotions, or even *Dorington*'s Devotions are incomparably better than those of the *Liturgy*; and I wonder how any Man that has read both can make the least doubt of it: Pray what shou'd make the *English* Liturgy so preferable? He answers, be-
'cause it is the Result of the wisest Council and most Mature
'Deliberation, the Effect of the United Endeavours of Men Holy
'and Wise, who no doubt implored and obtained the Assistance and
'Direction of the Blessed Spirit, in compileing a Form which they
'were perswaded was the Best and most acceptable Manner of
'worshipping God. But 1*st*, Has Mr. *Rhind* considered how small the Part of the Compilers was? They did indeed Tack the several Parts together; but the Materials were formed to their Hand. The *Lessons* out of the Old and New Testament and Apocrypha, the *Psalms* to be read Monthly, the *Epistles* and *Gospels*, the Passages of Scripture at the Beginning of *Morning* and *Evening Prayer*, the *Lord's Prayer* so often repeated, the *Venite Exultemus*, the *Benedictus*, the *Benedicite*, the *Jubilate Deo*, the *Cantate Domino*, the *Magnificat*, the *Nunc Demittis*, the *Deus Misereatur*, the *Litany*, the *Ten Commandments*, the *three Creeds*, the *Te Deum* were all of 'em formed long ere the Compilers of the Liturgy were born. The *Collects* are generally out of the *Breviary*; the Prayers in the Standing Offices out of the *Missal* and *Ritual*. Abstract these Parts from the Liturgy, and I suppose the Compiler's Work will appear to be very easie.

eaſie. *2dly*, Why did Mr. *Rhind* ſay that the Authors of the Liturgy compiled a Form *which they were perſwaded was the beſt and moſt acceptable Manner of worſhipping God*? Does he not know that all Hiſtory contradicts this? They did not ſo much as aim at that which was in it ſelf *beſt*, but at what the Times could beſt bear, with any Colour of Reformation; and therefore compoſed the Liturgy ſo as was moſt likely to gain the *Papiſts*, and to draw them into their Church Communion, by varying as little as well they could from the *Romiſh* Forms before in Uſe. This K. *Edward* ingenuouſly told the *Devonſhire* Rebells. 'Tho' *ſaith He*, it ſeemeth to you a New Service, 'yet indeed it is no other but the old, the ſelf ſame Words in *Engliſh* that were in *Latine*: For nothing is altered but to ſpeak with 'Knowledg that which was ſpoken with Ignorance, only a few 'Things taken out, ſo fond that it had been a Shame to have heard 'them in *Engliſh*. Thus He (*c*). And indeed the Reformers acted prudently, according to the then Circumſtances, in ſtriving what they could to gain the *Papiſts*: But to go on in the ſame Method now after a Hunder and Fifty Years Experience of its Unſucceſsfulneſs, and when 'tis plain that the altering it would gain the *Diſſenters*; this Conduct, I muſt needs ſay, argues a better Memory than a Judgment; and ſhews a much greater Regard to the *Popiſh* than the *Reformed* Intereſt. *3dly*, What Aſſiſtance of the Spirit was it which the Compilers implored and obtain'd? It was not Aſſiſtance as to the *Matter*. It was not Aſſiſtance as to the *Form*: For Mr *Rhind* has expreſly ſaid p. 175. *that our Prayers are not dictated by the Spirit either as to Matter or Form*. 'Tis then beyond my Comprehenſion to underſtand wherein they were aſſiſted; For, to ſay that they were aſſiſted in tacking the ſeveral Parts together, were to aſſign too low an Office to the Holy Ghoſt.

It will not be unpleaſant, ere I leave this Argument, to conſider the Motives which, Mr *Rhind* alledges, prevailed with the firſt Compilers and Impoſers of the Liturgy, to reſtrict Miniſters and People to the Uſe thereof.

'They were ſenſible, *ſaith He* p. 161, of the Diſadvantages of the Extem-

[c] *Holinſhed's* Hiſt. Vol. III. p. 1005.

'Extemporary Way, even in their own Experience: They ob-
'ſerved moreover, that the Ignorant, that is, the *Groſs* of Mankind,
'could not, and therefore did not pray at all; that the Gifted Bre-
'thren and their Hearers too often miſtook the Warmth and Quick-
'neſs of the Fancy, and the Readineſs of Expreſſion for the Dictates of
'the Spirit, which ſwelled the former with a High Conceit of them-
'ſelves (a Frame of Mind of all others the moſt unſuitable in Devoti-
'on) and made the latter Lie againſt the Holy Ghoſt: Beſides, they
'found that this Liberty which Men were allowed, ſometimes tempted
'them to vent their New and dangerous Notions, as the Inſpirations
'of the Holy Ghoſt; and therefore the Church, to aſſiſt the Weakneſs
'of the one, and to check the Vanity and Preſumption of the other,
'reſtricted both to the Uſe of Forms. Thus He.

A very pointed Speech this! But is there the leaſt Footſtep in Hiſtory to ſupport it? Is there the leaſt hint given that the Compilers and Impoſers of the Liturgy proceeded upon theſe Motives? Nay, is it not certain that they had not theſe Motives to Proceed on? Were the *Extemporizers* ſo early, as that the ill Effects of their Extemporizing appeared even before the compiling of the Liturgy? Is it not certain that till the compiling of the *Liturgy*, and the *Primer* that went before it, the People ſtill worſhiped according to the old *Popiſh* Forms? Yes. Every body that knows any thing of the hiſtory of the *Liturgy* knows all this to be true. Is it not ſtrange then that Mr *Rhind* ſhou'd abuſe his Reader with a whole String of Fictions? I cannot but heartily wiſh that our *Scots* Prelatick Writers wou'd conſult one another ere they publiſh their Productions: For, if Mr *Rhind* is right, he has quite defeat Doctor *South*, Mr *Calder*, the late *Vindicator* of the fundamental Charter, and I know not how many more of 'em, who make *Faithfull Cumming* and *Thomas Heath* a Ieſuite the firſt Authors of Extemporary Prayer in Q. *Elizabeth's* Reign, about *twenty* Years after the compiling of the Liturgy. Plainly, the other Writers of the party make Extemporary prayer an Invention to put the Liturgy out of Requeſt after it was formed. But Mr. *Rhind* makes Extemporary Prayer to have been firſt, and the Liturgy to have been compiled and impoſed on purpoſe to Remeed the ill Effects of it, and to prevent them for the future. Did ever any party before blow thus cold and hot? Was ever party ſo doom'd,

as

as they are, to contradict one another, or to blurt out what comes first, without regarding what they say or whereof they affirm?

Some perhaps may alledge in Excuse of Mr *Rhind*, that he meant all this of the *Scots* Liturgy sent doun by K. *Charles* I. *Anno* 1637. No. Through all his Book he does not so much as once mention that Liturgy; the *English Liturgy* he does, and sets it in opposition to the *Westminster Directory* p. 174. Besides, there was no need of the Assistance of the Spirit in composing that: For, except in some things wherein it comes nearer to *Popery*, and some few other things utterly indifferent, it was copied *verbatim* from the *English* Liturgy. And as they did not *need*, so the Event plainly shewed, that they *had* not the Assistance of the Spirit either in *composing* or *imposing* of it. It was *imposed* without Law by the Arbitrary Will of the Prince; and I'm sure the Spirit of God never assists Men in illegal practices. And for the *Composure* of it, 'tis known Archbishop *Laud* was the Father of it, with the consent of some others no whit better than himself. And that *Common Prayer* proved indeed the *Common Fire* of both Nations. 'We 'shall find them (the Bishops) saith the Excellent Lord *Falkland* in 'his forecited Speech, to have kindled and blown the Common 'Fire of both Nations, to have both sent and maintained *that* 'Book; of which the Author, no doubt, hath long since wished 'with *Nero*, *Utinam nescissem Literas*! And of which, more than 'one Kingdom hath Cause to wish, that when he wrote that, He 'had rather burned a Library, tho' of the Value of *Ptolemy's*. Plainly the great Intendment of that Book was a Conformity with *England*, by which we were never much Gainers in *former* Times; tho' no doubt we *shall* be so, now that we are upon the Footing of an *Union*, so legally founded, and whose *Articles* have hitherto been so sacredly maintained. But enough of this Argument.

Secondly, Mr *Rhind* argues for the Excellency of the *Liturgick* Way from *Universal Practice*. 'It has been, *saith he* p. 161, *undeniably* 'the practice of *all* Men in *all* Nations and Ages (if we shall only 'except these who truly were, or falsly pretended to be inspired) 'to address the true God, or their supposed Deities, by certain 'Forms. Mr *Rhind* is too positive. For as he cannot but know that this *has* been *denyed*, so, without the Spirit of Prophecy I can

foretell, it *will* be *denyed* to the End of the World. *The Practice of* all *Men*, saith he, *in* all *Nations and Ages*? Why, *first*, did our first Parents in the Estate of Innocence worship by Forms? No Man ever dreamed it; and I think *Milton* wou'd charm any Body from the belief of it by his incomparably beautifull Lines, wherein he describes their Morning Devotions which they payed to their Maker at the Door of their Bower (*d*).

Lowly they bow'd adoreing, and began
Their Orisons, each Morning duly pay'd
In various Stile, for neither various Stile
Nor Holy Rapture wanted they to praise
Their Maker, in fit Strains pronounc'd or Sung
Unmeditated, such prompt Eloquence
Flow'd from their Lips in Prose or Numerous Verse
More tuneable than needed Lute or Harp
To add more Sweetness......

This was the Original Practice, and 'tis to that we ought to aspire. *2dly*, Did any of the other Antediluvian Patriarchs Worship by Forms? Not a Word of this in the Scripture, and that is the only Book which gives us the History of that Time. 'Tis indeed said *Gen.* IV. 26. *Then began Men to call upon the Name of the Lord.* But, waving other Senses of that Text, Bishop *Patrick* tells us, that a great Number of the Jewish Writers, with whom M. *Selden* joins in his *De Dijs Syris*, and the Arabick Interpreter expound it thus *Then was there Prophanation by invocking the Name of the Lord viz.* by giving it impiously to Creatures. Whether that be the exact right Sense and Translation or not, is not to our present Purpose, yet thence we may gather that 'tis impossible ever to hammer a Liturgy out of it. *3dly*, Did *Abraham*, *Isaac*, *Jacob*, or any other down to *Moses* use a Liturgy or worship by Forms? No. There is not the least Intimation thereof in the Scripture. Here then we find 2000 Years, that is, the *third* Part of the World's Age fully spent, without so much as a Hint of *Forms*. How then cou'd it be the Practice in *all* Ages to worship by them? Yet further *4thly*, Is there any Hint of Forms for the Space of five Hundred

[d] Paradise Lost Book V. l. 144.

Hundred Years after *viz.* from *Moses* to *David*? 'Tis true we read of a Form of Words used upon some Solemn Occasions, such as the *Priest*'s blessing the *People* *Numb.* VI, and the Thanksgiving at the Offering of the First Fruits *Deut.* XXVI, and when the Ark went forward or rested *Numb.* X. But, that there was a stated Form for their *Daily Service*, there is a deep Silence in the Scripture; which is a certain Argument that there was none, seeing the Scripture is so minute in observing Particulars of much less Moment. 'Tis hardly to be thought that the Scripture, which noticed almost every *Pin* in the Tabernacle, and every Fringe and Plait in the *Priest*'s Vestments, wou'd have omitted the Form of Words to be used in the daily Service, if any such had been prescribed.

As there is no Mention of any Liturgy among God's *Peculiar* for so long a Time, so, I believe, 'tis as plain that there was none used elsewhere. *Homer* in his Iliad is the most Ancient, Authentick and Judicious Witness extant of the Devotions of the Pagans both *Greeks* and *Barbarians*. He hardly ever brings forth his *Heroes* to fight, or leads the Armies into the Field, but he sets them a Praying; and indeed he makes Them pray very well according to the then Theology. Yet he never makes the particular prayers of the *Heroes*, nor even the publick *Prayers* of the Army such as any Form directed, but such as Their present Circumstances suggested: And *Homer* knew the Rules of *Decorum* better than to have made Them pray *Extempore*, if it had been the then Custom to pray by *Form*.

Thirdly, He argues for the Preference of the *Liturgick* Way from *Heaven*'s *Approbation* of it both under the Old and New Testament p. 162. Well where is this Approbation to be found. 'Why, '*faith he*, what else are the greatest Part of the *Psalms* but Forms 'of Prayer and Praises, which were composed for, and used in the 'Service of the Temple? Right. And the *Presbyterians* make use of them to this Day in their publick Worship as much, perhaps more than ever the *Jews* did. So that thus far we are for *Forms* as much as they. And 'tis a most horrid and gross Calumny, *that the* Presbyterians *assert the Unlawfulness of set Forms.** I desire the Reader * N B to advert to this, because, not only Mr *Rhind*, but his whole Fellow Writers charge them with it, without so much as offering

at Proof of it. The reſtricting either Miniſters or People to Forms, to pray ſo and *no otherwiſe*, they avow to be impious Tyranny: But, that Forms are in themſelves unlawfull, they never aſſerted. Beſides, it is ridiculous to argue from inſpired Forms to Human Compoſures. *But*, adds Mr *Rhind*, *the* Jews *uſed Forms of their own Compoſure in the* Synagogue, *where our Lord was ſo often preſent, and yet he never declared againſt them.* But 1*ſt*, Why did not Mr *Rhind* point us to where theſe Forms might be found? There is not the leaſt Mention of them in the Four Goſpels. *The curious*, ſaith he, *may conſult them in the Original* Hebrew, *or as they are tranſlated into the more known Languages.* But why did he not name the Book? Every Body knows that many of their pretended *ancient* Forms of Devotion are meer Forgeries. And their *Modern* Forms are ridiculous in the laſt Degree. 2*dly*, Why has he not proved that theſe Synagogue Forms were *impoſed*, and that ſuch as officiate were *reſtricted* to them? Without this his Argument ſignifies nothing. 3*dly*, Was every Thing lawfull which our Lord did not declare againſt? By the Law of God the High Prieſthood was fixed in the eldeſt of *Aaron*'s Family. In Chriſt's Time it was ſet to Sale in the moſt mercenary Manner. *Cajaphas* was both Sacrilegious and an Uſurper. But where did Chriſt declare againſt either the Perſon or the Practice? *But*, urges he, *Chriſt himſelf preſcribed a Form, which is a precedent, whereas for the Extemporary Way there is neither Precept nor warrantable Example in the Scripture.* Is not this ſtrange Confidence? Are there no Examples of Prayer in the new Teſtament but the *Lord's Prayer*? Is there the leaſt Hint that any *one* of them was made by a Form? Is there the leaſt Hint that the *Lord's Prayer* it ſelf was uſed as a Form? Does he think none of the Prayers in the New Teſtament were *warrantable*? Let him find, if he can, from the *Beginning* of *Matthew* to the End of the *Revelation*, ſo much as any *one* Prayer made by a Form, and I'll quit him the Cauſe? Even the *Lord's Prayer* it ſelf when it was preſcribed by Chriſt, yet was not put up to God by *Him*; nay indeed He *could* not put it up to God, He could not ſay *Forgive us our Sins*, becauſe He had no Sin to be forgiven. And as for His Prayer in the Garden, will any Man ſay that Chriſt followed a Form in it? Nay indeed is not an Agony incompatible with a Form? A Form is too cold, a Kind of

of Service for such a violent Exercise of the Soul. Besides, it is certain that Christ did not thrice repeat the same Prayer in the same very Words. Nor does the Scripture assert any such Thing, as has been lately made out (*e*) beyond Possibility of Reply. And to make an Argument for stated and prescribed Forms, as Mr *Rhind* does p. 173, and his Brethren commonly do, from the Apostles using frequently the same Form of Blessing, is below even Meaness it self. The Apostle *Paul* himself does not always use the very same Words, and the Apostles *Peter* and *John* differ in their Words both from him and from one another. Suppose they had all three used the same Words always, it cou'd not have so much as the Semblance of an Argument for a Liturgy.

Fourthly, He argues for the *Liturgick* Way from the Usage of it in the Primitive and Ancient Church. *Certain stated Forms*, saith he p. 166, *being then* universally *used in the most solemn Administrations.* It were some Comfort to have to do with an Adversary who at least *pretended* to Proof; but, to be oblidged still to dispute against meer Assertion, is the most irksome Thing in the World. Our *Episcopal* Liturgists, a considerable while ago, gave *Advertisement* to the Nation (*f*) that they were to reprint a Body of Liturgies, to shew (I keep their own Words) *that in all Churches and Ages of Christianity Liturgies have been used.* They were instantly taken up on this (*g*) and desired to begin at the Right End, and to publish the Liturgies of the *three* first Centuries, which wou'd be a more prevailing Argument with the Presbyterians, then the Liturgies of *ten* Centuries immediatly back from our selves can be. But Nothing of this have they done, And I am very well assured it cannot be done. They are so far from being able to give us the Liturgies of *all* Churches, that I here defy them to give us the Liturgy of *any one* Church through the Broad Earth during that Period. But this is the ordinary Politick of the Writers of that Side, to gull their Lay Friends with Promises of what every Man in the World, who knows any Thing of these Matters, knows to be impossible to be performed. Certainly the Lord's Supper is the most *Solemn* of all the Christian Administrations; and if *prescribed Forms* had been used any

[e] See *Calder's* Ans. to the I Dialogue examin'd p. 36. 37. [f] *Scots* Courant Numb. 1037.
[g] See Letter to a Friend concerning M. *Calder's* Return. p. 15.

any where, they wou'd be moſt likely to be found there. The *Liturgical* Party then is deſired, as they value the Reputation of their Judgment or Learning, and as they wou'd not be held for meer Quacks and Mountebanks, to publiſh the *preſcribed* Forms that were uſed in the Adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper for the firſt *three* Centuries: Nay, to make their Task eaſier, to prove that there were *preſcribed* Forms uſed in the Adminiſtration of it. In the mean Time let the Reader ſay, what unparallel'd Confidence it was in Mr *Rhind*, to boaſt of *univerſal Uſage*, and yet not to adduce ſo much as *one* ſmall Inſtance for the Proof of it. But there is a People in the World that *make Lies their Refuge*, and therefore we are not to wonder at it.

Laſtly, He argues from the Practice of the *Reformed* Churches p. 167. It is very true the Reformed Churches have their Liturgies. But I have already * proved, that the *Scots* were not reſtricted to *Knox*'s Liturgy, but allowed to uſe their own Freedom. The Like is plainly obſervable in the *Belgick*, *French*, *Geneva* and *German* Liturgies. Nay ſome of the forreign Liturgies are not ſo much *Liturgies* as *Directories*. Such is the *Liturgia Tigurina* publiſhed by *Lavater*. The Reformers found it neceſſary in the Beginning of the Reformation, both upon the Account of People's Ignorance, being newly come out of the Popiſh Darkneſs, and upon the Account of their having been accuſtomed to *Forms*, to continue on in the ſame Method of Worſhip; and Things not being yet come to a Setlement in *England*, and the Clergy being exceeding weak, *Calvin* in His letter to the *Protector* adviſed a ſtated Form of Prayers: But that, when Things are brought into a regular Channel, and the Church furniſhed with *able Miniſters*, They ſhou'd yet be bound up from praying to God as His Spirit ſhould direct them, and as the emergent Neceſſities of their People might require, the Reformers never intended, *Calvin* never adviſed. On the contrary, immediatly after he has adviſed the *Protector* to ſettle a ſtated Form of Prayers; he excites him, by all Means to ſeek out for able Miniſters, that ſo the Native Vigour of the Goſpel might not languiſh through Occaſion of that Poli-

* See before P. 8.

Political Setlement (*h*). So much for Mr *Rhind*'s Arguments for the *Liturgick* Way, which this Nation, I'm sure, has no Reason to be fond of, when 'tis remembred that we never knew in earnest, from the first Dawning of the Reformation, what War, Confusion and Bloodshed meant, till a certain Headstrong Party wou'd needs impose it upon us in an Arbitrary Manner, and restrict the Nation to it, not only without Reason or Argument, but even without Shadow of Law.

He proceeds next p. 169 &c to answer the Objection against restricting People to *Forms* viz. *that they stint the Spirit.* And in Answer to this he absolutely denys that *the Spirit of God dictates the Substance and Manner of Prayer.* A Doctrine hitherto, I believe, unheard of among Christians. For, it is one of the peculiar Titles of the Holy Ghost to be stiled the *Spirit of Supplication*, because of that special Influence which He hath in the bestowing of this Gift. And as a *Spirit of Grace and Supplication* He is promised *Zech.* XII. 10. to all God's People. And *Gal.* IV. 6. it is given as the Character of all true Christians that *God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into their hearts crying* Abba *Father.* But Mr *Rhind* does not find this Gift *Viz.* the *Spirit of prayer* enumerated I *Cor.* XII. among the other *extraordinary* Gifts which were bestowed upon the Church at *Pentecost.* No Wonder truly. For it is none of the *extraordinary* Gifts, but what every good Christian, without Exception, is endued with. Nor did ever any Man (before Mr *Rhind*) that worshipped the true God, since the Creation of the World deny, that ever there was any good Prayer which was not suggested by the Spirit of God. But why do I speak of the Worshippers of the TRUE GOD? Even the Pagan Idolaters had a better Sense of Religion than Mr *Rhind.* Thus *Homer* in his ninth *Iliad* brings in old *Phœnix* Preaching to *Achilles.*

Prayers are the Daughters of Almighty Jove. Upon which Madam *Dacier* comments thus. *For 'tis God inspires Prayers, and teaches Men to Pray.* The Apostle *Paul* asserts expresly *Rom.* VIII. 26. *That we*

[h] Sic igitur statum esse Catechismum oportet, statam sacramentorum administrationem, publicam item precum formulam. Sed non hoc eo pertinet ut istius politici ordinis in Ecclesia occasione, vigor ille nativus prædicationis Evangelij ullo modo consenescat. In illud potius incumbendum est tibi, ut idonei & sonori Buccinatores conquirantur. ---- *Calv.* Ep. ad protect. *Angliæ.*

we knew not what we ſhould pray for as we ought: But that the Spirit helpeth our Infirmities and maketh Interceſſion for us with Groans that cannot be uttered. But if, according to Mr *Rhind's* Doctrine, the Spirit dictates neither *Matter* nor *Words*, neither *Subſtance* nor *Manner* of Prayer, how can he be ſaid to *help our Infirmities?* Mr *Rhind* ſaw how croſs this Text lay to his Doctrine, but, to avoid the force of it, he puts ſuch a Comment upon it as was never heard of before, ſuch a Comment as is heretical in the higheſt Degree, nay ſuch a Comment as ſubverts the very Foundation of the Goſpel. Plainly, he affirms that Men's *Fervency* and *Sincerity* in prayer is the ſole Effect of their own Endeavours: And that the Office of the Holy Ghoſt is not to excite *to*, or aſſiſt *in* Prayer, but to interceed *for* the *Acceptance* of it.

That I may not be thought to aggravate Matters, take his own Words p. 170. 171.

'And if *the Spirit helpeth our Infirmities*, it is ſuppoſed that we do 'ſomething our Selves, and that whatever is wanting to make 'our prayers *acceptable*, that, and that ONLY the Spirit ſupplies. 'Now, that the Spirit does *not* furniſh the *Matter* or *Words* of our 'prayers, appears from the very Text, where we are told, that the 'Aſſiſtance which it affords, is its *Interceſſion*, which is not made in 'Words, but *with groanings that cannot be uttered.* Thus You ſee 'this Text is ſo far from ſerving their purpoſe, that it rather proves 'againſt them; ſeeing it plainly ſuppoſeth that Men uſe their Endea-'vours: Now what Endeavours can they uſe, but to prepare the '*Matter*, to reduce it to a *Form*, and to carry *along with them* as 'much *Fervency* and *Sincerity* as they can, AND THEN THE 'HOLY GHOST DOES IN AN INEFFABLE MANNER 'INTERCEED FOR THE *ACCEPTANCE* OF THE WHOLE. Thus he.

Here is Doctrine for Chriſtians with a Witneſs. *Firſt* an abſolute Denial of all Internal Operation of the Spirit of God in us; not only in Oppoſition to the Scripture, which he appears to have no Regard to; but in direct Contradiction to the *Engliſh* Liturgy which teaches * that *all Holy Deſires proceed from God. Secondly*, An inverting the Office of the Perſons in the Sacred Trinity, by making

* Second Collect at Evening Prayer.

making the Holy Ghost our Mediator for *Acceptance* instead of Christ. Hear Dr *Whitby* on the forecited Text. ' The Spirit of God, *saith* ' *He*, is said to *interceed* for us, not as an *Advocate* or Mediator be- ' twixt *God* and *us*, that being the office of our great High *Priest*, ' but as an *Exciter* or *Director* of us in our Addresses to God, to ren- ' der them for MATTER according to the Will of God, and for ' MANNER fervent and effectual. Thus He in a peremptor Contradiction to Mr *Rhind*'s Doctrine. To Dr *Whitby* let us join Bishop *Wilkins* (*i*) ' The Spirit of God, *saith he*, must be our Guide ' and Assistance in this Duty. He must help our Infirmities and ' make Intercession for us. *Not that the Holy Ghost is our Mediator* ' *of Intercession*, that is properly the Office of the Son, who is there- ' fore stil'd our *Advocate*. *There is one Mediator betwixt God and* ' *Man the Man Christ Jesus*. 'Tis He *only* that in Respect of His ' Merits and Sufferings does make Intercession for us Rom. VIII. 34. ' But now, because the Spirit of God does *excite* our Hearts to pray, ' and *infuse* in us Holy Desires, *stirring* us up *to*, and *instructing* ' us *in* this Duty, therefore he is said to *interceed* for us. Thus he, And thus all the Christian World ever taught.

And thus now I have laid out this *Particular* with all Fairness. * Mr *Rhind's* Doctrine is evidently Heretical and subversive of the Gospel: And I lay it before the *Episcopal* Clergy for their Censure. If they shall in a publick Manner disown it, it is not to be imputed to them, nor any more Noise to be made about it. But if not, they must excuse us, if we look upon them as Abettors of the avowed Enemies of Christianity. * N B

Whatever else Mr *Rhind* has advanced on this Head is like the Talk of a Man troubled with a *Delirium*. Such as *first*, ' that Means are ' useless if our *Prayers* be immediatly inspired, and that they ought ' to be registrated among the infallible Dictates of the Spirit which the ' *Modern Prophets* pretended to. p. 171, 172. For, the *Presbyterians* neither do, nor ever did pretend to an unerring Dictament of the Spirit in their Prayers, but to such gracious *Infusions*, *Excitations* and *Directions*, in the Use of Means, both as to the *Matter* and *Manner* of our prayers, as we have just now heard Dr *Whitby* and Bishop *Wilkins* pleading for. And as to the *Modern Prophets*, he ought, out of Respect

[i] Ubi supra p. 4, 5.

to his own Party, to have been silent about them, seeing all their Proselyts were gain'd from the *Episcopal* Side, according to the best Information I can have. Of the same Nature is what he says. 2*dly*, 'That 'the *Presbyterians* can have no Title to the Influences of the Spirit, 'because they have departed from the Communion of the Church p. 172. I hope indeed there is no *Presbyterian* within the Communion of Mr *Rhind*'s Church. For, to deny the Assistance of the Spirit as to the *Matter* and *Manner* of our Prayers, making them the Fruit of our own Endeavours allenarly; and to assign to the *Spirit* the Office (which is *Christ*'s peculiar) of *pleading* with God for his *Acceptance* of our Prayers; is, I affirm, such execrable Doctrine, as is inconsistent with the Possibility of Salvation, if continued in. To as good Purpose is what he adds. 3*dly*, 'That the *Presbyterians praise* God by 'certain Forms, without Regard to the stinting of the Spirit, when '"tis undeniable that the Spirit can as freely dictate *Praises* as *Prayers*, 'and *Metre* as well as *Prose*. p. 173. Right, he can do so. And has he not dictated the *Matter* of the *Psalms*? And does he not assist as to the *Manner*, I mean, with *Fervency* and *Sincerity* in singing 'em? And is not every Minister in his Congregation left at Freedom to pitch upon such a Portion of 'em, for the Spiritual Solace of his People, as the Spirit of God, in the Use of rational Consideration, suggests to him to be most suitable to their Case? Here is all the Freedom was ever pleaded for by the *Presbyterians*. Whereas by the *Liturgy* Ministers are obliged to such particular *Psalms* according to the Day of the Month appointed by the Book, how unsuitable soever they may be to the present Case of the Congregation. 4*thly*, He wou'd know of his Adversaries what they understand by *stinting the Spirit*. p. 173. He had Reason indeed to ask them, because 'tis very plain he himself knew not. I can impute it to nothing but Vapours, that he imagines they constitute the Spirit of Prayer in a Freedom of *Changing the Phrases, and transposing the Petitions*. But I shall explain the Matter to him by some few Instances which may make it easily understood. A Minister, I shall suppose, is to meet with his Congregation for worshipping God. Before he comes forth to them, he has taken Pains to get his Soul impressed with a deep Sense of the particular Sins and Wants of the People committed to his Charge. When he is come to Church; according to the *Presbyterian* Way, he is at Freedom in Prayer to break out into a particular Confession of their Sins with-

with their *particular* Aggravations; and to make a *particular* Representation of their Case before God, and to use such pleadings with him for them, as are warranted or precedented in Scripture in the like Case. This is surely the most *reasonable Service*, most accceptable to God, and most likely to affect & edifie both the Minister and People. But on the other Hand, by the *Liturgick* Way a Minister must not so much as venture on any Thing of this, but is obliged to content himself with that dry and *general* Confession which is in the Book, and that under all the Pains of *Nonconformity*; which, how heavy they are, many Thousands have felt, in the Ruin of all their Worldly Concerns. Is not this a *Stinting of the Spirit* with a Witness.

Cant is a Term of Reproach, which the *Episcopalians* (Mr *Rhind* too among the rest p. 190. 197.) never fail to twit the *Presbyterian*'s with. This they improve so mightily upon, that if some Young Fellow of 'em, when setting out into the World, have pick'd up that word any where at a Conversation over a Bottle, the empty Thing concludes himself stock'd, and strait Commences both *Wit* and *Atheist* upon it; and thenceforth pronounces all serious Piety especially the *Presbyterian* prayers to be *CANT*; because forsooth, there was one Mr *Cant* once a *Presbyterian* Minister at *Aberdeen*. I confess it is not through any Defect of Duncery, any more than of Debauchery, that they talk at this Rate. *Cant* is truely a Term borrowed from the *Begging* Trade. When the idle feigned Fellows are got into, and Chime over to every Passenger, a Rote of Words, not which the sense of Want suggests; but which they have contrived and Conn'd for their purpose. This is indeed *Cant*, and there is too much Cause to impute this to the *Liturgick* Worship, where they still Tone over the self same thing the self same Way, whatever Disposition they find their Souls in. But on no Account can it be charged on the *Presbyterian* Way, even in *Sense* much less in *Justice*: For it is their *Case* and their *Want* which is their Prompter; and they think it a ridiculous thing to be obliged to Beg by Rule *. Yet further, that I may make Mr *Rhind* understand what the Presbyterians

* *Men' moveat quippe, et* Cantet *si Naufragus aſtem*
Protulerim? Cantas, *cum fracta te in trabe pietum*
Ex humero portes. Verum, nec nocte paratum
Plorabit, qui me volet incurvaſſe querela.

Pers. Sat. I. L. 88.

sbyterians mean by *ſtinting the Spirit*, I ſhall ſuppoſe the Miniſter has read the *Morning Prayers* in the *Liturgy* with his Congregation; and now he intends to *Preach* to them. Is it not reaſonable that, ere he begin, he ſhould put up a *particular* petition for Aſſiſtance, to himſelf in ſpeaking, and to the people in hearing? There is no ſuch petition in the prayers which he has read; and if he venture upon a prayer of his own; ſtrait all the *Highflyers* are on his Back, and Dr *South* tells him, (*k*) *that it is a Senſeleſs and abſurd practice, and that the* Canons *and* Conſtitutions *of the Church are not reſponſible for it*; And he ſhall be ſure not to eſcape without being branded for a *Puritan*. The ſame will his Fate be, if he adventure to pray over his Sermon *after* he has preached it. *We heartily deſire* (ſaid the Eleven Biſhops and the other dignified Clergy at the *Savoy* Conference) (*l*), *that* GREAT *Care may be taken to ſuppreſs thoſe private Conceptions of prayer* BEFORE *and* AFTER *Sermon* (*m*). Is not this to *ſtint the ſpirit*. Are *generall* petitions enough, as Mr *Rhind* wou'd perſuade us p. 174. when we are called to be *particular*? If ſo, then I propoſe this prayer as ſufficient for the whole. *Almighty and Merciſull God, we beg that Thou may give us whatever thou knoweſt to be neceſſary and convenient for us, through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, Amen.* I'll undertake, this prayer is as comprehenſive, not only as *any*, but even as *all* the prayers of humane Compoſure in the *Liturgy*: Yet who wou'd endure to be reſtricted to ſuch a *General*? Yet further, when People are reſtricted to the *Liturgick* Way, not only *neceſſary* Petitions are omitted, but they are oftimes forced upon Petitions which are either abſurd in themſelves, or againſt which their Conſcience recoils, ſo that they cannot put them up in Faith. To give an Inſtance or two, When the *Prince of Orange* landed in *England* 1688, 'tis very well known the Body of the *Engliſh* Clergy favoured his Attempt, yet for ſeveral Months after, they not only were obliged in Law, but actually did pray for K. *James*, begging in the Words of the *Liturgy*, that *God wou'd confound the Devices of his Enemies*. Once more, When Prince *George* of *Denmark* Her Majeſty's Husband was dead, the Clergy continued as formerly to pray for Iſſue to

[k] Serm. Vol. II. on Eccleſ. V. 2. [l] See the Conference p. 57. [m] See ſecond Dialogue on the Liturgy p. 6. 7.

to her Majesty, till that Clause of the *Liturgy* was discharged by an Order of the *Council*. This is no Secret, for we had it in the Publick News Prints. Were these Petitions either reasonable or decent? I hope by this Time Mr. *Rhind* understands what the Presbyterians mean, when they say the *Spirit is stinted* by Forms. 5*thly*, He Objects p. 174. that 'if the preparing the Substance of 'a Prayer does *stint the Spirit*, then are they who are obliged to 'follow the *Westminster Directory*, no less guilty than they who use 'the *Liturgy* of the Church of *England*. 'Tis answered. No Man is obliged to follow the *Westminster Directory* so closely, but that he may leave out some of the Petitions mentioned in it, or insert others as in prudence he shall think meet. Thus It self directs, 'We 'judge this to be a Convenient Order, in the Ordinary publick 'Prayers, yet so, as the Minister may defer (as in prudence he 'shall think meet) some part of these petitions, till after his Ser-'mon, or offer up to God some of the Thanksgivings hereafter ap-'pointed in his prayer before his Sermon. And as to the very Words in the *Directory*, the Minister is not at all restricted to them, but only *to call upon the Lord to this Effect*. But Mr. *Rhind* was resolved to be throughout Chimerical. *Lastly*, He objects p. 176. 'that all publick Prayers are unavoidably Forms to the Congrega-'tion, and therefore *stint the Spirit* as much as any *Liturgy* in the World. Senseless Stuff! The people meet in the Congregation, not to offer up their own *Separate* Prayers, but to join with the Minister, who is their Mouth to God in *prayer*, as he is God's Mouth to them in *Preaching*. There is then Nothing required of them, in that Case, but Fervency and Sincerity in joining with the petitions that are put up for them; nor does the Spirit operate otherwise, in that Case, than to help them to such Sincerity and Fervency, not at all to suggest to them Prayers of their own distinct from the publick Prayers.

Thus now I have gone through Mr. *Rhind*'s Arguments which tho' contemptible in the last Degree, yet are not only the *best*, but indeed the *whole* of what the party have to offer. They are either ignorant of, or willfully mistake the *Presbyterian* principles concerning prayer, and then instead of disputing against them, they dispute against their own Frantick Notions. They still dispute as we heard Mr. *Rhind* doing against the *Infallible Inspiration* of the Spirit in

prayer

Prayer. But such as cannot conceive, how one may be assisted by the Spirit either in Prayer, or indeed in any Holy Exercise, without being under his *infallible Conduct* so as to be kept altogether from Error or Imperfection, such, I say, who cannot conceive this are beyond arguing with, and should be left to themselves. That every good Man is acted by the Spirit of God, is the common Belief of the whole Christian World. But if any Man shou'd deny this, and alledge that it wou'd follow thence, that every good Man were perfect and infallible, what else shou'd people do but pity and pray for the foolish Objector? How often does the Church of *England* Her self pray for *INSPIRATION*? Thus in the Collect before the Communion, *Cleanse the Thoughts of our Hearts by the* INSPIRATION *of Thy Holy Spirit.* Thus in the Collect on the fifth Sunday after *Easter*, *Grant to us thy humble Servants, that by Thy holy* INSPIRATION *we may think those things that be Good.* Thus in the prayer for the whole State of Christ's Church Militant-.....*Beseeching Thee to* INSPIRE *continually the Universal Church with the Spirit of Truth.* Does any Body think that those prayers import an *Infallible Guidance and Assistance?* As little do the Presbyterians mean, that They are under an Infallible Conduct, when They say Their prayers are *Inspired.* But our *Scotch* Episcopal Clergy neither know the Scriptures nor indeed the *English* Liturgy which they are so fond of. Let them tell us in what Sense they understand what is said in the *Preamble* to the Liturgy, *viz. That by an Uniform Agreement it was concluded on* BY THE AID OF THE HOLY GHOST, and then we shall easily explain to them how our Prayers are Inspired.

I shall conclude my Defence of CONCEIVED Prayer (which I have hitherto call'd *Extemporary*, only in Compliance with Mr. *Rhina*'s Phrase) with the Words of Bishop *Wilkins*, who at once shews the Meanness of Mr. *Rhina's* Objections, and reproves the Prophaneness of his Spirit (*n*).

'But now, in the *Second* Place, for any one so to sit down and 'satisfy himself with this *Book-Prayer*, or some *prescript Form*, as to 'go no farther, this were still to remain in his Infancy, and not to

[n] Ubi Supra p. 9. 10.

'to grow up in his new Nature: This would be, as if a Man 'who had *once* need of Crutches, shou'd *always* afterwards make 'use of them, and so *necessitate* himself to a continual Impotence. 'Tis the Duty of every Christian to grow and encrease in all the 'parts of Christianity, as well *Gifts* as *Graces*; to exercise and im-'prove every Holy Gift, and not to stifle any of those Abilities 'wherewith God hath endued them: Now how can a Man be 'said to live suitable unto these Rules, who does not put forth 'himself in some Attempts and Endeavours of this Kind? And 'then besides, how can such a Man suit his Desires unto several 'Emergencies? What one saies of *Counsel* to be had from Books, 'may be fitly applyed to this *Prayer* by Book; that it is commonly 'of it self, something *Flat* and *Dead*, floating for the most part too 'much in *Generalities*, and not *particular* enough for each several 'Occasion. There is not that Life and Vigour in it to engage the 'Affections, as when it proceeds immediatly from the Soul it self, 'and is the Natural Expression of those particulars whereof we 'are most sensible. And if it be a Fault not to strive and labour 'after this Gift, much more is it to *jeer* and *despise* it by the Name 'of *ex Tempore Prayer*, and praying *by the Spirit*; which Expressi-'ons (as they are frequently used by some Men by Way of Re-'proach) are for the most part a Sign of a * *Prophane* 'Heart, and such as are *altogether* Strangers from the 'Power and Comfort of this Duty. Thus Bishop *Wil-kins*. And had others, more nearly concerned, treated Mr. *Rhind* with the same Freedom, he had never publish'd such a Book, so much to the Scandal of Religion and the Shame of the Party He writes for.

* N. B.

SECT.

SECT. II.

Wherein Mr Rhind's *Objections againſt the* Presbyterian *Doctrine concerning the* Sacraments, *and his Exceptions againſt their Manner of Diſpenſing them, are conſidered. From P.* 177. *to P.* 185.

TO Begin with *Baptiſm*. Concerning this Mr *Rhind* aſſerts roundly and without Fear *Firſt*, That Baptiſm with Water is *indiſpenſibly* Neceſsary, ſeeing without it none can reaſonably expect to be baptized with the Spirit, or that they ſhall enter into the Kingdom of God, nay that, if God's extraordinary Mercy does not interpoſe, they ſhall be damned without it. *Secondly*, That the Water is the Vechicle of the Spirit, and that the inward Grace does *always* accompany the outward Mean, *when it encounters with no Renitency in the Recipient*. Having laid down theſe Principles, He objects *Firſt*, That the *Presbyterians* teach that Baptiſm is of no Efficacy. *Secondly*, That they ſuffer Children to die without it. *Thirdly*, That their *Confeſſion of Faith*, whereof ſome Doctrines are dubious and ſome impious and falſe, is the Creed into which they baptize. *Fourthly*, That the genuine *Presbyterians* urge the Obligation of the *Solemn League and Covenant*, and preſs it as a neceſſary Condition of the Child's Admiſſion to Baptiſm.

Baptiſm

As for his *Firſt* Aſſertion. *That Baptiſm with Water is* indiſpenſibly *neceſſary*, it is directly Popiſh. The *P*resbyterians willingly grant that the Contempt or willfull Neglect of Baptiſm is damnable, I mean, in an adult Perſon, or to the *P*arent who neglects to procure it for his Child. But that the meer Want of it is damnable to the Child, or to an adult *P*erſon when he cannot have it in an orderly Way

Way, that is, according to Christ's Institution, this I affirm is a damnable Error, an Error which gives one the most unworthy Notions of God, an Error which hath been the fruitfull Mother of many others and of the most scandalous Practices. It is to this Error the *Limbus Infantum* owes its Being, to this is owing the Practice of Lay *Baptism* by *Women* as well as Men in the Church of *England*; yea by Jews, Turks and Pagans, as well as by Christians, as is allowed in the Church of *Rome*. It is to this Error these hasty Baptisms are owing, where there is no *Profession* by, no Sponsion for the *Party* baptized; than which there can hardly be a greater Scandal on the Christian Religion. For, it exposes that Holy Mystery to the same Reproaches wherewith the Heathen *Lustrations* were so justly loaded *. But I need not insist on this. The excellent *Forbes a Corse* before cited has sufficiently exposed that execrable Doctrine at large in *Six* Chapters (*o*). The Church of *Rome* has found it too hard for her to answer him on that Head. But indeed there is nothing too hard for our Modern *Episcopalians*, who do all their Business by Assertion, Proof being too great a Drudgery.

Mr *Rhind's Second* Assertion is like unto the *First*. When the Council of *Trent* decreed (*p*) That the Sacrments confer Grace *non ponentibus Obicem*, it gave Scandal to all the World: For it turns these sacred Ordinances into meer Charms. Yet Mr *Rhind* has new vamped it, requiring Nothing else but a *Non-Renitency* in the Recipient, whereas the Scripture expresly requires the *positive* Qualifications of faith and Repentance. Yea, the *Scots* Episcopal Liturgy supposes these Qualifications even in Infants. Thus in the Catechism.

Q. *What is required of Persons to be baptized?*

Ans. Repentance, whereby they forsake Sin, and Faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the Promises of God, made to them in the Sacrament.

Q. *Why then are Infants baptized, when by Reason of their tender Age They cannot PERFORM them?* M m *Ans.*

---

* *Omne nefas, omnemque mali purgamine causam*
Credebant nostri tollere posse Senes.
Græcia principium moris fuit: illa nocentes
Impia lustratos ponere facta putat.
Ah nimium faciles, qui tristia crimina cædis
Fluminea tolli posse putatis aqua.
Ovid. Fast. Lib. II.

[o] Instruct. Hist. Theol. Lib. X. Cap. VI. VII. VIII. IX. X. XI. [p] Can. VI. De Sacramentis in Genere.

Anſ. Yes: They do PERFORM them by their Sureties, who promiſe and vow them both, in their Names: Which when they come to Age, themſelves are bound to perform.

Thus alſo it *was* in the *Engliſh* Liturgy, but after the *Reſtauration* they altered it, and daſh'd out the Word PERFORM in the beginning of the anſwer to the laſt Queſtion. And they had good Reaſon to do ſo: For a vicarious Performance of Faith and Repentance is a pretty dark Myſtery. I'm ſure it wou'd be Nonſenſe in a *Presbyterian*; and yet the Alteration they have made mends not the Matter a Whit. But that is not it we are at preſent concern'd about, 'tis plain that the Doctrine of *Non-Renitency* is a Stranger to the Scriptures. But Mr *Rhind* was for bruſhing forward in his Chat; diſpleaſe whom he will, he has the Church of *Rome* on his ſide. So much for his *Aſſertions*. Next to his *Objections*.

Firſt, He objects, That the *Presbyterians* teach that *Baptiſm is of no Efficacy* p. 178. What Anſwer is to be given to this? None ſo proper as that of the *Pſalmiſt*, *What ſhall be given unto thee? Or what ſhall be done unto Thee, thou falſe Tongue? Sharp Arrows of the Mighty, with Coals of Juniper.* Pſ. CXX. 3, 4. Hear the *Presbyterians* declare themſelves in their *Confeſſion of Faith* (*q*). 'The Ef-'ficacy of Baptiſm is not tyed to that Moment of Time wherein 'it is adminiſtred: Yet, notwithſtanding by the Right Uſe of this 'Ordinance, the Grace promiſed is not only offered, but really ex-'hibited and conferred by the Holy Ghoſt, to ſuch (whether of 'Age, or Infants) as that Grace belongeth unto, according to the 'Counſel of God's own Will, in his appointed Time. The *Presbyterians* have no where declared that any baptized Infants are Damned: But to aſſert, as the *Engliſh* Liturgy does (*r*), 'That Child-'ren which are baptized dying before they commit actual Sin, are 'undoubtedly ſaved, is ſo far from being *certain by God's Word*, that I affirm there is not one Title from the Beginning of *Geneſis* to the End of the *Revelation* to ſupport it. God has his own Way of dealing with

[q] Chap. XXVIII Sect. 6. [r] Penult Rubrick in the Office for publick Baptiſm of Infants.

with Infants, which we are sure is most Just and Holy. But it is *secret* to us. And therefore to determine, that all that die in that State unbaptiz'd are damn'd, and that all that are Baptized are undoutedly saved, is very high Presumption. 'Tis a very usual Thing among the Popish Missionaries to Baptize the Infants of the native *Indians* Clanculary, without the Knowledg or Consent of their Parents, when They can find any secret Occasion. Will any Protestant determine, that such of them thus baptized as die in their Infant State are therefore *undoubtedly* saved? Must the absurd and unwarrantable Action of a vagrant Fellow conclude God as to the Disposal of His Creatures? This is such nonsensical Doctrine as is fit only for the Church of *Rome* which God has given up to Delusions.

Secondly, He objects, 'That the *Presbyterians* cruelly suffer wretched 'Children to die without Baptism, than which Nothing can be more 'opposite to the Doctrine of Christ who expresly says *John* III. 5. 'That *except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into* '*the Kingdom of God.* Might not one have expected, that he wou'd have adduced so many Instances as might have made his Charge *presumably* true, and justified it so far, as that it might affect the Body of the *Presbyterians*? Nay but he has not even offered at so much as one Instance. 'Tis very true *Presbyterian* Ministers will not baptize Children in a Hurry, nor content themselves with pronouncing the solemn Words without a previous Profession or Sponsion. And in this both Scripture and Reason justify them. They are still ready to baptize Children, when 'tis desired, in a regular and orderly Way: But, when it cannot be done but in such a Manner as represents Baptism as a Charm, and exposes the Christian Mysteries to the Contempt and Reproach of prohane Persons; they don't think it lawfull for them to dispence it, and herein they are Justified by Bishop *Hall* (*s*) who expresly says, *that as Baptism is not to be negligently deferred, so 'tis not to be superstitiously hastened.* But, which is of much more Import, they are very sure that, in such a Case, the Want of Baptism is not prejudicial to the Salvation of the Child;

[s] Decad. V. Ep. IV.

For it were moſt horrid to think, that a Mercifull God ſhou'd damn Infants for what was not their own Fault in any Reſpect.

As for that Text which Mr *Rhind* inſiſts on *Except a Man be born* &c it is moſt ridiculouſly applyed in this Caſe. For *that*, as well as all Scripture Declarations of the like Nature are calculated, not for Infants, but for adult Perſons and ſuch as are come to the Exerciſe of their Reaſon. To ſuch it is not only neceſſary (as it is alſo to Infants) that they be internally ſanctified, but alſo that they make an outward Profeſſion by receiving Baptiſm. For Chriſt will own none for his Diſciples that are aſhamed of Him before Men. Plainly, the Import of that Text may be eaſily gathered from the Occaſion of it. *Nicodemus* was a diſcreet Perſon, and had a honourable Opinion of our Saviour, that He was *a Teacher come from God*. But then he had come to Jeſus *by Night*, which argued that he was timorous, and loath to profeſs publickly the inward Sentiments of his Soul. Wherefore Chriſt knowing his weak Side, and underſtanding the Reaſon of his *Night Viſit*, inſtantly and at firſt Daſh tells him the Uſeleſneſs of internal Perſwaſion without an open Profeſſion; that it was neceſſary he ſhould be *born again* (which is a Phraſe taken from the *Jewiſh* Doctrine about *Proſelytiſm*) not only *of the Spirit* by Sanctification and the renewing of the inner Man, but *of Water* too by an open and undaunted Profeſſion before the World, of which Baptiſm wou'd be the Badge and Token, without which latter he cou'd not own him for His Diſciple, any more than without the former. This is the plain Senſe of that Text; but what Relation has this to Infant Baptiſm, which is not founded upon that Text, nor indeed reaſonably can be, but upon other Scripture Grounds which I need not now mention. And that the ſaid Text does not prove the Damnation of Infants dying without Baptiſm, I ſhall produce the Judgment of two Biſhops. The Firſt is of *Hopkins* late Biſhop of *London-Derry* in his Sermon upon it. Having narrated that Comment upon it which Mr *Rhind* has given us, He adds. 'But this 'Opinion is unwarrantable, and contrary to the received Judg-'ment of the Church in the Primitive Times, who, if they had 'thought the baptiſmal Regeneration was indiſpenſibly neceſſary 'to Salvation, wou'd not certainly have ſtinted and confin'd the 'Adminiſtration of it only to two Times of the Year *Eaſter* and *Penticoſt*,

'*Pentecoſt*, thereby to bring upon themſelves the Blood of their 'Souls that ſhould in that *Interim* have died without Baptiſm. Thus he. The other is *Joſeph Hall* Biſhop of *Exeter* in his Letter, to the Lady *Honoria Hay*, juſt before cited on the Margin. Throughout all that Epiſtle, which I recommend to the Reader's Peruſal, he diſputes with the greateſt Force of Reaſon againſt that Opinion of the Damnation of Infants dying without Baptiſm, and in Terms calls it *The hard Sentence of a Bloody Religion.*

All this Doctrine of the Damnation of Infants dying without Baptiſm is founded upon another falſe Doctrine licked up by Mr *Rhind*, *viz.* That the Water is the Vehicle of the Spirit, and that the very act of Baptiſm carries *always* with it an inward Regeneration, and that none can have the Spirit *without* or *before* Baptiſm. This is plainly contrary to the whole Tenor of the Scripture, and tho' it was too early entertained by ſome of the *Fathers*, yet, 'tis certain it was not the received Doctrine of the Primitive Church; as, beſides many particular Teſtimonies that might be adduced, will appear from theſe *three* general Conſiderations.

Firſt, It was a very prevailing Cuſtom among them to delay their Baptiſm till they were *in extremis*. In ſome indeed this proceeded from a Tincture of the *Novatian* Hereſy: But others, for Inſtance, *Conſtantine* the Great who was no *Novatian*, delayed it upon other Conſiderations. But now, if Chriſtians had believed that they cou'd not have the Spirit, nor be internally regenerated, nor be Members of Chriſt or the Children of God till they were made ſuch in Baptiſm, and that they ſhou'd certainly become ſuch in Baptiſm; wou'd all the World have been able to perſwade them to delay it? 'Tis very hard to think ſo.

Secondly, The ſame appears from the Hiſtory of the *Catechumens*. During that State they were Probationers, not only as to their Knowledg, but likewiſe their Piety and Manners; and were obliged, before they cou'd be admitted to Baptiſm to give moral Evidence of the Grace of God in their Hearts, in a Word to have every Thing in Chriſtianity, but the Solemn Inveſtiture, which both confirmed what they had, and entitled Them to further Degrees.

Thirdly, Tho' Infant Baptiſm was ſtill allowed as *lawfull* in the Catholick

Catholick Church, yet it did not *universally* obtain for several Centuries; so that (If I am not much mistaken) the *Necessity* thereof was not asserted before the Council of *Carthage* in the Year 418. Certainly had Christians believed, that the Water is the Vechicle of the Spirit, and that we cannot be spiritually Regenerated *without* it or *before* it, and that in the very Act of it we are spiritually Regenerated, they wou'd never have omitted it. I do not adduce this to justify them in that Omission, but only thereby to shew that Mr. *Rhind*'s Doctrine was not the Belief of the Primitive Church as he without proof alledges.

In a Word Faith and Repentance are prerequired to Baptism in *adult* Persons at least. If they can have Faith and Repentance without the Spirit and spiritual Regeneration, which is not obtain'd (as They say) but in and by Baptism, I don't see why They may not go to Heaven without the Spirit or spiritual Regeneration. For I'm sure Repentance towards God and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ is the Sum of the Gospel. But Enough of this for this Time.

Thirdly, Mr. *Rhind* objects, 'That the *Confession of Faith*, where-'of some Doctrines are dubious, some Impious and false, is the 'Creed into which the *Presbyterians* baptize. I answer *1st*, That however dubious, false and impious these Doctrines are, yet I have already proved them to be the Doctrines of the Catholick Church of Christ. *2dly*, 'Tis false that the *Confession of Faith* is the Creed into which They baptize They baptize into the Belief of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and only declarativly assert Their *Confession of Faith* to be agreeable thereto. *3dly*, Suppose They did baptize into their *Confession of Faith*, why is not that as lawfull as baptizing into the *Apostle's Creed?* Are they not both humane Compositures? Or does he dream that the Apostles themselves were the Authors of it? But this only *ad Hominem*. For my own Part I assert, that it is unlawfull to baptize into the Belief of any human Composure otherwise than as I have explain'd above.

Lastly, He Objects, 'That the genuine *Presbyterians* press the 'Obligation of the *Solemn League and Covenant* as a necessary Con-'dition of the Child's Admission to Baptism. 'Tis denyed, and Mr. *Rhind*

Rhind is challenged to prove it. I affirm further, that there is no *Presbyterian* Minister in the Nation who will refuse to baptize in the Terms of the *Directory*, among which Terms there is not so much as *Mention* of the *Solemn League and Covenant.* Mr. *Rhind* is challenged to disprove this if he can. So much for Baptism.

I proceed next to consider his Objections relating to the other Sacrament *viz.* The *Lord's Supper.* As to this he Objects upon. I. The *Infrequency* of it among the *Presbyterians* II. The *Indecency* wherewith They celebrate it. III. The hard Terms upon which They admit to it. IV. That it is indeed no Sacrament at all as dispensed by them. Of these in Order. The *Lord's Supper.*

I. He objects upon the *Infrequency* of the Lord's Supper among the Presbyterians. *In the* Presbyterian *Communion*, saith he p. 182, *my Lot might fall in a Place where the* Holy Eucharist *would not be administred once in a Dozen of Years.* For answer. 1*st*, Has he given Instance of any such Place? No, not so much as one. 2*dly*, Suppose he had given one, two, three, nay even a Score of Instances, were the Constitution to be charged with that? There are, no doubt, careless Ministers among the *Presbyterians*, as well as in other Communions, but none but a mean malicious Soul will load the whole Body with the Defects of a few. 3*dly*, Was the *Episcopal* Clergy, during their Reign before the *Revolution*, less guilty than the *Presbyterians* are? I am content it be put to a Trial through the Nation. And, to begin the Work; within the Presbytry of *Dumbartan*, where I serve, there are *Seventeen* Parishes. I affirm that in these *Seventeen* Parishes taken complexly, the better to mend the worse, the Communion has been celebrated *three times oftner* within these Dozen Years last by past, than it was during the whole twenty eight Years under the *Episcopal* Reign before the *Revolution.* 4*thly*, Is the Church of *England*, to which Mr *Rhind* is gone over, innocent in this Particular. Hear Dr *Wetenhall* late Bishop of *Kilmore* in his Book entitled *Due frequency of the Lord's Supper*, dedicated to Her Majesty, and printed at *Edinburgh* 1706. 'Amongst the Laws of our 'Church (saith he in his Dedication) as there is none perhaps 'more excellent and truly Christian, than those touching the Lord's 'Supper; so it is hard to assign ANY MORE NEGLECTED, than the

'the Rubricks which injoin Due Frequency of it; and the Neglect 'is not only in COUNTRY-PARISHES, but even in some GREAT-'ER CHURCHES. Thus the Bishop. Why then wou'd Mr *Rhind* leap out of the Frying Pan into the Fire? Why wou'd he charge the *Presbyterians* with that whereof his Brethren both in *Scotland* and *England* have been so notoriously guilty? But, an impudent Way of writing is become the Characteristick of the modern *Episcopal* Authors.

II. He objects upon the *Indecency* wherewith the Lord's Supper is celebrated among the *Presbyterians*. Wherein lyes this Indecency? 'Why, *saith he* p. 182, the Convocation has more of the Confusi-'on of a Fair, than of the order and Decency of a religious As-'sembly. And how can it otherwise be, when they not only al-'low, but encourage, on these Occasions, such Rendevouzes of the 'promiscuous Rabble, who desert their own Churches, to the great 'Hinderance of their Devotion who communicate, and Scandal too, 'when they see so many professed Christians neglect their Lords 'express Command of keeping up the Memorial of his Death and 'Passion for them. For Answer. *1st*, Tis true, Communicants have been very numerous among the *Presbyterians* ever since the *Revolution*. Not only the Inhabitants of the Parish in which the Communion is celebrated, but many from the neighbouring Parishes, attested by their respective Ministers, have usually joined in it; But is the Numerousness of Commuicants either a Fault or an Indecency? So far from it, that cou'd the whole Christian Church communicate at once, it wou'd be so much the more of the Nature of a *Communion*, and tend so much the more to the Honour of our Blessed Saviour. But this Objection of Mr *Rhind*'s proceeds from *Silliness*, or, which is the same Thing, from Envy; because during the *Episcopal* Government, in many Places the Minister and his Family, with the *Sexton* and his, and perhaps two or three more made up the whole Communicants. *2dly*, 'Tis true likewise, that there are many others present oftimes besides those that Commnnicate. But where is the Harm of this? Does it *hinder* the Devotion of the Communicants, that others are looking on them? Is it not rather an Engagement upon Them to carry Themselves with the more solemn Gravity? Or how can the presence of such as do not communicate be a *Scandal* to those that do? For, tho' They do not communicate at *that* time, it cannot

cannot inferr a Neglect of our Lord's Command, seeing people are not at *all* Times in a Frame for Communicating. And when a Minister comes to assist his Neighbour Minister in dispensing the Communion, is it either Fault or Scandal for his People to follow him where they are furnished with Sermon? Is not this better than that they should loiter idly at Home all the Lord's Day, which wou'd be both a Sin in them, and give Scandal to others? But this Objection of his was indeed too mean to have been noticed.

I wou'd only ask Mr *Rhind* if there are not incomparably greater Indecencies in the Way of the Church of *England*, to which he has *separated*. Is it possible there can be a greater Scandal, than to see a known Rake, notour for all Manner of Vice and Leudness, partaking of those holy Mysteries, before he has given the least Proof or Evigence of his Reformation? Yet this is every Day seen in the Church of *England*, and the Priests cannot, dare not help it.

I am not to alledge this without proof, that were the *Episcopal* Way of writing, which I don't envy. I shall give good and sufficient Documents of it. Mr *Bisset* a Presbyter of the Church of *England* has lately told us (*t*) 'of a Minister who was worried 'out of his Living and Life too, for denying the Communion to 'a *Rake*, before the Chancellor had excommunicated Him. Again tho' the *Rubric* require, *that so many as intend to be Partakers of the Holy Communion shall signifie their Names unto the Curate, at least sometime the day before.* Yet (says the same Author p. 51.) 'this is 'more than I ever knew done. I'm sure 'tis omitted in all or 'most of the *London* Churches. Yet further he tells us p. 54. that Dr F----r *was suspended for denying the Sacrament to such as only came to it as a Qualification to sell Ale and Brandy. Lastly*, he tells us (*ibid*) of a Solution that was given to one (who doubted of coming to the Communion) in these Words *What Damage is it to pledge the Parson in a Cup of Wine, supposing only the Wine be good.* To Mr *Bisset* let us add the Author of *The Case of the Regale and Pontificat*, who is known to be most violently *High Church*. He roundly asserts p. 179 'that an Action lies against the Minister who shall

[t] Modern Fanatick. p. 43.

'refuse the Sacrament, to them who he knows, sees and hears in 'their Conversation and Principles, to be *never so much* unqualifyed. These are not *Presbyterian* Alledgances, but true *Episcopal* History.

III. He Objects p. 183. upon the *Hard Terms*, on which the *Presbyterians* admit to the Communion, in Two Particulars. The *First*, relating to the *Persons*, the *Second* to the *Posture*. *First*, As to the *Persons*. He alledges 'They will admit none who in the 'least favour the *Hierarchy* and *Liturgy* of the Church of *England*, 'but Excommunicate them with the vilest Blasphemers and Adulterers. I ask him, Does he know any of the *Favourers* of the *Hierarchy* and *Liturgy* who were ever denyed the Sacrament on that Account? Has he given any Instance of this? Not one. The *Presbyterians* debarr none from Communion with *Them* in the Sacrament, whose Principles and Life do not debarr Them from the *Christian* Communion. They don't look upon that Holy Ordinance as the distinguishing Badge of a Party or of any particular Communion of Christians; but as the Common Priviledge of all the Faithfull. And therefore They usually *Fence* the Lord's Table in the Words of the Scripture I Cor. VI. 9. *Know ye not that the Unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God? Be not deceived: Neither Fornicators, nor Idolaters*---or some such like Scripture; or by going through the *Ten Commandments*. If Mr *Rhind* can name any *Presbyterian* Ministers who do otherwise, I suppose the Church will not think her self obliged to defend them. But, to exclude the Impenitent Breakers of any of the *Ten* Commandments from the *Priviledge* of Gospel Mysteries; to debarr those from the Lord's Table, whom the Lord has, by the expres's Sentence of his Word, debarred out of the Kingdom of Heaven; is, what every one, who is not quite lost in Impiety, must own to be not only *lawfull* but a *Duty*.

This is sufficient to vindicate the *Presbyterians*: But who shall vindicate the Church of *England* Constitution? Mr *Rhind* is the most unlucky Man in the World. He has separated from the *Presbyterians*, upon a Chimerical Imagination of the Narrowness of their Charity, that they admit none to the Communion, who in the least Favour the Hierarchy and Liturgy; tho' I suppose, there is no one living can bring Instance, where ever they refused it, on that Score, to any who desired it: And yet he has gone over to the Church of *England*, whose Divines, I mean the High-Church Party

Party of 'em, have declared in the ſtrongeſt Terms, that they will not admit to it *Diſſenters* or *Presbyterians*, whom they, in their equally wiſe and charitable Stile, call *NOTORIOUS SCHISMATICKS* at the ſame Time that they declare them to be *without the Church*. This is plain from the *Repreſentation made by the lower Houſe of Convocation to the Archbiſhops and Biſhops* in the Month of *December* 1704. which the Reader may conſult. And Mr. *Barclay* a Teacher of the Party, juſt come from *London*, has told his Mind very honeſtly in this Caſe. *I ſhall not*, ſays he *, *ſtick to ſay that I would not admit a* NOTORIOUS SCHISMATICK, *to Catholick Communion, till he recanted his Error, upon any conſideration of Laws or Statutes.* I don't think but Mr. *Barclay* may be eaſie on that Head: For, I ſuppoſe, theſe *NOTORIOUS SCHISMATICKS* he ſpeaks of will not give him much Trouble that Way. However, 'tis plain that *High-Church* has made the Communion a Badge of a Party. Was not Mr. *Rhind* then very well adviſed in going over to Her?

Secondly, As to the *Poſture*. Mr. *Rhind* Objects, 'That the *Presbyterians* diſcharge that as Idolatrous, which others think moſt 'expreſſive of their inward Devotion, and debarr ſuch from the 'Communion who wou'd uſe it. There is no doubt he means the *Poſture* of *Kneeling* which is enjoined both by the *Scotch* Epiſcopal and the *Engliſh* Liturgies. And as to that, I here engage that no one *Presbyterian* Miniſter in the Nation ſhall, on that Account, refuſe the Communion to any Perſon who can prove, or find any other to prove for him, either 1*ſt*, That that Poſture was commanded by Chriſt. Or 2*dly*, That it was uſed by the Apoſtles when They communicate in Chriſt's preſence. Or 3*dly*, That there is any Hint of its Uſage in the New Teſtament Or 4*thly*, That it was practiſed in the *Primitive* Church for the firſt *Five* Centuries at leaſt after Chriſt. If none of theſe Things can be proved, as I am ſure none of 'em can, and which every Writer on the *Epiſcopal* Side, of any Character, owns; why ſhou'd a Church break Her Order to gratify people in their Fancies, when 'tis confeſſed on all hands That, that Poſture of *Kneeling* in the Sacrament has been uſed to the moſt Idolatrous Purpoſes. But Mr. *Rhind* alledges

* Perſwaſive to the People of *Scotland* p. 167.

'That such as are for that Posture are ready to attest the Searcher of Hearts that their Adoration is only directed to the one True and Living God, and His Son Jesus Christ, who is exalted at his Father's Right Hand. I answer. So is the Church of *Rome* ready to attest with the same Solemnity, That when She worships before the Picture of an Old Man, She does not worship the Image but God the Father by it. Yet who will excuse Her from Idolatry on that Account?' And, which renders this Business of *Kneeling* still so much the more Suspicious, the late *Vindicator* of the *Fundamental Charter of Presbytry* is angry at the Rubric in the Liturgy which explains the Reason of Kneeling at the Lord's Supper, and expressly says p. 79. That *neither hath the Church gained, nor can the Liturgy be said to have been made better by it.* But of this, and the dreadfull Blunder in History he has committed to support this His Opinion, the Reader may perhaps hear more elsewhere. Yet further, why may not *Presbyterians* confine People to the *Table Posture* in the Sacrament which the *Episcopal* Divines themselves own was the Posture used by the Disciples in Christ's presence; when the Church of *England* confines People to the Posture of *Kneeling* for which there is no such Warrant, and appoints (*v*) every Minister to be suspended who wittingly gives the Communion to any that do not Kneel. Some may perhaps think that our *Scotch* Episcopalians are milder in that Matter, and indeed the above mention'd *Vindicator* of the *Fundamental Charter* wou'd have us believe so. 'It is true, *saith he* p. 34. all communicate in 'the Sacrament of the Eucharist, kneeling; but I know none, that 'would deny the Sacrament to one, who could not without Scruple take it in that Posture. This is spoken with Abundance of Gravity, but with what Integrity let the Reader judge, when he considers *1st*, That the Rubric in the *Scots* Episcopal Liturgy is as strick for kneeling as in the *English* Liturgy. And *2dly*, the *Scots* Episcopal *Canon* with Respect to that Posture is equally strict with the *English*, as may be seen both in the *Canon* it self and in *Clarendon*'s History. Does not this shew their Spirit and Principles, tho' they yield at present to gull unwary People?

Before

[v] Canon XXVII. 1603.

Before I proceed to Mr *Rhind's* next Objection, there is one thing I cannot but take notice of. The *Episcopal* People have lately caused reprint the Liturgy which was sent doun for *Scotland* by K. *Charles* I, and which began the Troubles *Anno* 1637. and I am informed that it is begun to be practised in some of their Meeting Houses instead of the *English* Liturgy. I think my self obliged in Charity to advertise People, * That that Liturgy, in the *Office* for the *Communion*, is a great deal worse than the *English*, and is plainly calculated for Begetting in People the Belief of the Corporal Presence. I shall at this Time give *three* Evidences of this. 1*st*, The *English* Liturgy has a long *Rubric* declaring that, by the Posture of Kneeling no Adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporeal Presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood. The *Scots* Liturgy neither hath this Declaration, nor any Thing equivalent to it. 2*dly*, the *English* Liturgy has a *Rubric* enjoining the Minister at the saying these Words in the Consecration, *When he had given Thanks He brake it*, to break the Bread. The *Scots* Liturgy has no such *Rubric*, nor any Appointment for breaking the Bread, any more than the *Roman Ritual* has. 3*dly*, The *English* Liturgy enjoins the Minister to deliver the Bread to the People in Order, into their Hands *all* MEEKLY *Kneeling*, but the *Scots* Liturgy Words it, All HUMBLY *Kneeling*; that we might know They intended Adoration by that Posture, tho' they have not told, to what. I may possibly have Occasion, sometime after this, to shew particularly how much worse the *Scotch* Liturgy is than the *English*. But I thought it needfull to give these Hints now, because the *Episcopal* Clergy bear their People in Hand, that it is upon the Matter one and the same with the *English*. Particularly Mr *Smart*, one of their Teachers at *Edinburgh*, in his *short Discourse after Sermon, commending the Service told them* p 8. 'That 'there is no *Material* Difference between the *Scotish* and *English* 'Books of Common-Prayer; and that they differ as little as the 'Scotish and *English* Tongues. The first of which Assertions is false, as I have just now made out; and the latter Nonsense. For, so far as it follows the *English* in Matter, it is the very same in Words and Phrase; and no Wonder, for every Body knows it was of *English*

* NB

Engliſh Birth, which herhaps made it take ſo ill with the *Scots* Air. But enough for Mr *Smart*, whoſe Name and Pamphlet are ſo very ill ſuited, and whoſe Character ſeems to be the very Reverſe of the Apoſtle's Precept, *Being in Underſtanding a Child, howbeit in Malice he is a Man.*

IV. Mr *Rhind* objects p. 184. *That it is no Sacrament at all as diſpenſed by the* Presbyterians. Pray why? *There is,* ſaith he, *no due Application of the Form to the Matter.* Very ſtrange! They always read the Words of Inſtitution either out of the Goſpels or out of I *Cor.* XI. They have ſtill, after our Lord's Example, a Prayer, Thanksgiving or Bleſſing of the Bread and Wine. Is not this a due Application of the Form to the Matter? 'No, *ſaies* 'Mr *Rhind*, the Form in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, are 'the ſame Words by which our Lord did at firſt conſtitute the 'Sacrament *viz.* *Take, eat, This is my Body, Do this in Remembrance* 'of Me, and Drink ye of this Cup, for this is my Blood: *Do this as* 'oft as ye Drink it in Remembrance of Me. Very well. Do not the Presbyterians uſe theſe Words? Are they not in the Inſtitution? 'Nay, but, *ſaith he*, if they be at all, they ought to be uſed in that 'Prayer by which they intend to conſecrate the Elements? Is there any *Precept* for this in the Scripture? No. Any *Example* there? None. Any Evidence for the *Practice*, for at leaſt *four* or *five* Centuries after Chriſt, in the Writings of the *Fathers*? Not any. The firſt Account we have of it is in the *Books of the Sacraments* (*x*) which paſs under the Name of *Ambroſe*, and are inſerted among his Works. But I hope Mr. *Rhind* knows that theſe Books were not writ till ſome Ages after *Ambroſe*'s Death. And if Mr. *Rhind*'s Doctrine be true, the Church of *England* Her ſelf, for a long Time after aboliſhing the Maſs had not the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. For, that which is call'd the *Prayer of Conſecration*, and in which the Words, *Take, eat, this is my Body* &c are, was not in K. *Edward*'s firſt Liturgy: But inſtantly after the Prayer *We do not preſume* &c. They proceeded to the Diſtribution. Nay, which is worſt of all, we are aſſured from the Infallible Chair, that the Apoſtles uſed no other Prayer of Conſecration but the *Lord*'s *Prayer*

[*x*] Lib. IV. Cap. V.

Prayer (*y*). And, I suppose ever Body knows that these Words, *Take, eat, this is my Body*, are not in that Prayer; and I think 'tis plain they were never intended to stand, in that Form, in any Prayer.

But now to gratifie Mr. *Rhind*, let us suppose that these Words shou'd be in the *Prayer of Consecration*, what follows? Why, *there*, saith he, *they are never once mentioned by the Presbyterians, and too often there is. Nothing equivalent to supply the Defect.* Did he ever consider what he said? Did he ever regard whether it was true or false? Is not every Minister *Directed* (*z*) upon that Occasion to pray, 'That God may sanctifie the Elements both of Bread and 'Wine, and so bless his own Ordinance, that we may receive by 'Faith the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ crucified for us, and 'so to feed upon Him, that He may be one with us, and we with 'Him; that He may live in us and we in Him and to Him, who 'hath loved us and given himself for us. Is not here something equivalent to these Words? And can Mr *Rhind* name that Minister who does not pray either thus or to the same Purpose. But *proving* was none of his Business, all he had to do was to *Assert*.

I doubt not but after all this the Reader will think strange that Mr *Rhind* should have mentioned such an Objection. But the Case is plain, as he was avowedly *Popish* on the other Sacrament, so is he upon this; and wou'd insinuate upon People the very rational Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* to be effected by the pronouncing of these particular Words. And *Bellarmin* led the Way to him (*a*), so that he has indeed a Man of a very considerable Name for his Master.

Thus now I have gone through the *Episcopal* Objections against the *Presbyterian* Worship both as to *Prayers* and *Sacraments*. And I hope I have made it plain that there is not any one of the Things objected against, but what (so far as the Objection is true) is so far from being a Ground of *Separation*, that it is highly justifiable. But then, I must ask Mr *Rhind*, why, as he has given us the Grounds of his *separating*

[*y*] *Gregor.* Lib. 7. Ep. 63. Orationem autem Dominicam idcirco mox post precem dicimus, quia mos Apostolorum fuit, ut ad ipsam *solummodo* orationem oblationis hostiam consecrarent.

[*z*] See the *Directory*. [*a*] De Sacram. Eucharist. Cap. 12. 13.

rating from the *Presbyterian* Worſhip, he has not alſo anſwered the other half of the *Title* of his Book, and juſtified the known Objections againſt the Worſhip of that *Church* whoſe *Communion* he pretends to have *embraced*. I have hinted at ſeveral of 'em as I came along, and they may be found more at length in ſome ſmall Tracts lately publiſhed (*b*). Was there *Nothing* in the Liturgy that he ſtartled at? I obſerve, the above cited Mr *Smart* p. 9. with much Aſſurance, bids his Audience *read it all over, and among all the Prayers that are in it, ſee if there be any Prayer for the Dead, any worſhipping of Images, any praying to Saints and Angels.* I do not ſay that there are any *Prayers for the Dead in it*, but the Famous Author of *the Caſe ſtated* expreſly ſays p. 189. there are, and proves it from the *Order for the Burial of the Dead*, and from the Prayer for the *Church militant* in the *Communion Office*. I do not ſay that there is any *worſhipping of Images* in it. But I ſay, that many of the *Common Prayer* Books are filled with ſuch Pictures as are condemn'd by the *Homilies* of the Church of *England*, yea and by the High Church Divines themſelves; witneſs the laſt cited Author (ſuppoſed to be Dr *Leſly*) who, in his *Converſation* with the *Roman Catholick Nobleman*, tells him p. 135. *We abſtain from the Pictures or Images of the Saints in our Churches, becauſe they have been abuſed to Superſtition and to avoid Offence.* Now if they are unlawfull in Churches, how is it poſſible they can be lawfull in Books appointed for the Church-Service? That ſame Author likewiſe in the ſame Place approves of the Zeal of *Epiphanius*, who finding a Linnen Cloth hung up in a Church Door (it is likely to keep out the Wind) whereon was a *Picture* of *Chriſt* or of ſome *Saint*, tore it and ordered a dead Corps to be buried in it. And lamented the *Superſtition* he ſaw coming by theſe *Pictures* and *Images* then beginning to creep into the *Church*. Yet in *England* not only the Common Prayer Books, but even the *Bible* it ſelf is filled with Pictures of Chriſt and the Saints; witneſs the Bible, printed *London* by *Charles Bill, and the Executrix* of *Thomas Newcomb deceas'd Printers to the Queen's moſt excellent Majeſty*, 1708. Many Copies of which Impreſſion are ſtuffed with ſuch Pictures. Are they more innocent in the *Bible*, than upon a Linnen Cloth

[b] See the Dialogues between the Curate and the Countryman &c.

Cloth hanging in the Church Door? Yea, which is most abominable, there are several Obscene Pictures among 'em, particularly that of *Noah* Uncovered Gen. IX, *Lot* and his two Daughters Gen. XIX, *David* and *Bathsheba* 11 Sam. XI. Finally, I do not say there is any praying to Saints and Angels in the Common Prayer-Book. But I do say, that the consecrating Churches and Days to them, and the appointing particular *Offices* upon these Days to their Honour is the likest Thing to worshipping them that I can conceive. Besides, did Mr *Rhind*'s nice and scrupulous Conscience never bogle at the *Ceremonies* of Human Invention? If the Church have Power to institute such, she has certainly Power to make a new Bible; For there is no such Power given her in the old one: Or if there is, certainly Protestants have been much in the Wrong to the Church of *Rome*. But I am not now to insist on these Things.

CHAP. V.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's *Fourth Reason for His Separating from the* Presbyterians *viz.* That Their Spirit is diametrically Opposite to that of the Gospel, *is Examined, From P.* 185. *to the End.*

THE Meaning of this *Reason* is, That Presbyterians are *incarnate Devils*: And the Intendment of it is, That all Persons who regard Conscience or Duty should hang out a *Bloody Flag* against 'em, and rise up with one accord, and spoil Their Goods and destroy

ſtroy Their Perſons; or, to ſpeak in Dr. *Sacheverel*'s much more elegant Stile, That the Biſhops ought to thunder out the Eccleſiaſtical *Anathema*'s againſt Them, and let any Power on Earth DARE reverſe them; and that the People ſhou'd treat Them like *growing Miſchiefs or infectious Plagues* *. This is indeed ſomewhat hard; but ſuch is the *Epiſcopal* Charity, ſuch are the mercifull principles wherewith they ſeaſon Their new Converts, and ſuch is the Uſage we are to expect whenever the Sins of the Nation ſhall ripen to that Height as to provoke a Holy God to let in *Prelacy* upon it. But to make way for Particulars.

The *Presbyterians* neither are nor deſire to be of thoſe who *juſtifie themſelves*. They know and confeſs that there are *Tares* in Their Field as well as *Wheat*; and are ſenſible that They have the outmoſt Reaſon to cry with the Publican *God be mercifull to us Sinners*: But they think it a very ſhameleſs Thing in the *Epiſcopalians*, that *They* ſhou'd be the firſt who take up Stones to caſt at Them: For, if the *Presbyterians* are great *Sinners*, I'm affraid (were that the Enquiry) *the Epiſcopalians* wou'd not be found to be very great *Saints*.

Our Saviour has given us an excellent Rule whereby to judge of Men's Spirits, *By their Fruits ye ſhall know Them*. I hope it needs not be deem'd a Reflection upon Them, or an immoderate flattering of our Selves to affirm, That the *Presbyterians*, generally ſpeaking, are as *Devout* towards God, as frequent at Their Prayers; and, to *outward* Appearance (for God only knows the *Heart*) as fervent in Them as the *Prelatiſts*. That They ſwear as ſeldom by the Name of God, as ſeldom tear open the Wounds of our Bleſſed Saviour, and as ſeldom imprecate Damnation upon Themſelves or others as the *Epiſcopalians*. That They are as *Sober* and Temperate, go as ſeldom Drunk to Bed, are as mild in Their Carriage, as little given to Bullying or Bluſtering, as thoſe of *High-Chnrch*. That They are as *juſt* in Their Dealings with Their Neighbours, as open Handed to the Indigent, Their Poor as content, Their Rich as Humble, that They make as kind Husbands, as dutifull Wives; as carefull Parents and as obedient Children; as juſt Maſters and as faithfull Servants, as thoſe that live in Communion with the *Biſhop*.

No

* Serm. Falſe Brethren p. 38.

No Man that's capable of making Obſervations, and is not quite loſt to Ingenuity, will deny any of theſe Things. If I had ſaid more, and affirmed, That 'Outrage, Murder and Aſſaſſinations are the 'known Practice of the *Highflyers*, as well as of the bigotted *Pa-'piſts*, and that Their true Mother Tongue is, *I will not fail to cut 'your Throat by G--d*, it wou'd be thought hard; yet I might be very well excuſed, becauſe Mr. *Biſſet* a Presbyter of the Church of *England* has ſaid every Word of it before Me (*c*).

But, that Mr. *Rhind* may have all due Advantage againſt the *Presbyterians*; There are many Things he has charged Them with as very odious, which They not only freely confeſs, but boldly avow. Such as, for Inſtance. *Firſt*, When He charges Them p. 189. That They believe *uncommon Meaſures of the Spirit of our Lord to be ſtill neceſſary in the Work of Converſion.* The whole Catholick Church of Chriſt in all Ages ſtill believed ſo; and I never ſuſpected but that thoſe of the *Epiſcopal* Communion had believed ſo too, till their new Diſciple, whom, no doubt, They have inſtructed in all Their *Arcana*, inform'd Me otherwiſe. The Scripture tells us That *if any Man have not the Spirit of Chriſt He is none of His:* But to ſay, that this Spirit is *common* to all the Baptized Swearers, Curſers, Whoremongers and Adulterers through the Country, or that it is *Common* to ſuch who live in a habitual Neglect of God or Unconcern'dneſs about their Souls and Eternal State, even tho' They are free of Scandalous Sins, This I judge to be the rankeſt Blaſphemy. And if that Spirit be not *common* to all ſuch Perſons, then certainly it is an *uncommon* Spirit, or there are *uncommon* Meaſures thereof by which good and Pious Men are acted. *Secondly*, When He charges Them, *ibid*, with teaching That *the beſt Actions of Men before the Grace of God are but ſo many ſplendid Sins.* They own They do believe this, as we have ſeen before p. 10. the Church of *England* does. *Thirdly*, When he charges Them p. 195. That *They have a hidden Spice of Devotion in Their Tempers.* They are ſo far from being aſhamed of this, that They pray, Would to God there were more of it. *Fourthly*, When He Charges Them *ibid. That upon the Commiſſion of ſome* Grievous *Sin, They are affected with horrible Apprehenſions.* The *Presbyterians*

[c] Ubi Supra p. 8.

own that, in that Case, they ought to be so: For, they know that it exposes them to the Wrath of God; and believe, that *it is a fearfull thing to fall into his Hands.* And tho', in that Case, *Their Souls* (that I may use Mr *Rhind*'s Words p. 189.) *and commonly their Bodies too are in the greatest Disorder*, yet, they find that the Holy Men of God upon Scripture Record have been the same Way affected in the *like* Case. Thus *David* Psal. XXXVIII. 3, 4, 5. *There is no Soundness in my Flesh, because of thine Anger: Neither is there any Rest in my Bones; because of my Sin. For mine Iniquities are gone over mine Head: As an heavy Burden they are too heavy for me. My Wounds stink, and are corrupt: Because of my Foolishness.* In like Manner *Heman* Ps. LXXXVIII. 14, 15. *Lord why castest thou off my Soul? Why hidest Thou Thy Face from me? I am afflicted and readie to die, from my Youth up: While I suffer thy Terrors I am distracted.* The Bishop of *Sarum*, when instructing Ministers (*d*) how to deal with those of their People that are troubled in Mind, delivers himself thus. 'Some have committed *enormous Sins*, 'which kindle a *Storm* in their Consciences; and that ought to be 'cherished, till they have compleated a Repentance proportioned to 'the Nature and Degree of their Sin. Thus he, and thus every one, who is not quite abandon'd of God, wou'd teach. But Mr *Rhind* is not for having People affected with *horrible Apprehensions* upon the Commission of *grievous Sins*, much less for having these Apprehensions cherished till they are brought to Repentance. What Times are we reserved to! *Fifthly*, When he charges them with a *serious Air* p. 202, with a *peculiar Vehemency* in Preaching, with a *Preciseness of Conversation* p. 204, with *Discourses of the Love of God and Christ, and sweet Communion with the Father and the Son* p. 205. The *Presbyterians* are so far from being angry at this Charge, that They are sorry there is too little Ground for it; and They are heartily sorry that the *Episcopal* Clergy shou'd have had so little Regard to Piety, to the Honour of Religion, and to their own Reputation with all serious People, as to have cherished such a Book.

For besides these Instances, Is it possible any thing can be more *Prophane*, than to jest, as he does p. 194 &c, upon People's *Exercise* of Soul about their Eternal Concerns? Does not the Apostle command

[d] Pastoral Care IV. Edit. p. 176, &c.

mand *Timothy* 1 Ep. IV. 7 to *Exercise* Himself unto Godliness? Nay does he not command all Christians to *work out Their Salvation with* FEAR *and* TREMBLING? Has the *Episcopal* Party found out an *easier* Way of getting to Heaven? Is it possible any Thing can be more *prophane* than His charging *Presbyterians* p. 200. with resolving much of the Spirit of Religion into *Amorous Recumbancies*, and that *They think that They'll recommend Themselves to God after the very same Manner as to their Mistresses*? Was not this plainly intended to burlesque the Scripture? Is there any thing more familiar in the Scripture than to represent the Intercourse 'twixt God and the Soul by the Love of the *Bridegroom* and the *Bride*, of the *Husband* and the *Wife*? And if these study to recommend themselves to each other by an Agreeableness of Temper, and doing what They know will be well-pleasing to each other; is it culpable in the Soul to study to be assimulated to God, to be made *Partaker of the Divine Nature*, and to do what is well-pleasing in His sight? What are his *amorous Recumbancies* but a *Comical* Phrase whereby he designed to ridicule the *Scripture* Expression *Cant.* VIII. 5. *Leaning upon her Beloved*, which is literally the *English* of it? Is it possible any thing cou'd be more *Prophane* than to strick at (as he does p. 190) the Work of Regeneration through the sides of the *Presbyterians*, whom he represents as talking of 'Their feeling 'the strugglings of the Babe of Grace *in the Place of bringing* 'forth of *Children*, a passage, *saith he*, of the Prophet impertinently 'applyed by them to this purpose? For was there ever any Christian that denyed the *Turning of the Soul to God* to be expressed in the Scripture by the *Birth of a Child*? Don't the *Arminians*, Does not the Church of *Rome* her self own this? And is there not the greatest Reason for it, if we consider either the *Difficulty* or the *Greatness* of the Change wrought upon the Soul thereby? Was there ever any Christian who applyed that passage of the *Prophet* to any other purpose than that of the *Turning the Soul to God*? Even *Grotius* Himself upon the place applys it thus, 'That *Ephraim* 'was not wise who so long delayed to repent and turn to God, 'and so to deliver Himself out of his Calamities. Cou'd there be any Thing more *Wicked* than to load the *Presbyterians* (as he does p. 197.) with the Scandal of *Major Weir* that Son of Perdition,

tion, *who*, saith he, *prayed those who joined with him into Raptures:* For, supposing it were true he had done so, which yet Mr *Rhind* and all his Party can never prove, how cou'd this affect the *Presbyterians*? Was there not a *Judas* among the Twelve Disciples? Can any Man prove but that He was equally gifted with the Rest? Yet who ever reproached either Christ or the College of the Apostles on his Account? Or who dare say but that God may employ such as are *Sons of Perdition* themselves as Instruments of Salvation to others? Cou'd any thing be more *Wicked* than to represent (as he does p. 190. 196) the *Presbyterians* as *doing Execution upon themselves through Despair?* There is no doubt but *Presbyterians* are liable to be oppressed with Melancholy as well as others, and that some in that Communion may sin themselves so far out of the Favour of God, as that in his just Judgment he may give them up as a *Prey* to Satan. But why shou'd the *Presbyterian Spirit* be reproached with this? Tho' the News Prints from *London* * tell us that, last Year, from the 16th of *December* 1712 to the 15th of *December* 1713, there were 34 *Persons*, within the Bills of Mortality, guilty of *Self-Murder*, will any Body therefore charge *Prelacy* and *Liturgy* therewith, tho' rampant there? Because I can name a famous Divine of the Church of *England* who truss'd up himself in his Canonical Belt, were it therefore just that I shou'd load the Spirit of the Church of *England* therewith?

Mr *Rhind* does indeed name Two Books *viz. Shepherd's sincere Convert*, and *Guthries Trial of a saving Interest in Christ*, as leading Men into that Course, or into deceitfull Hopes founded upon *Animal* Impressions. As for Mr *Shepherd's* Book, I am not so much concern'd about it, he was a Man that as I'm informed had *Episcopal* Orders, and was sometimes of *Emanuel* College in *Cambridge*. And I will not undertake to defend some *Peculiarities* he has in his Writings; let Mr *Rhind*, who is more obliged, do it at his best Leisure. But that there is any Thing in that Book that has the least Tendency either to drive Men into Despair, or to encourage them to bottom their Hopes of Heaven upon false Grounds, I absolutely deny, and challenge Mr *Rhind*

* See the *Evening Post* Numb. 683.

Rhind to prove it: For hitherto he has acted as an avowed *Calumniator*, in not daring to cite so much as one Passage of the said Book for making good his Charge.

As for Mr *Guthrie*, he was a genuine *Presbyterian*, his Book is written in a most familiar Stile, adapted to the *Capacity* of every common Reader, and to the *Feeling* of every good Christian: And God has so signally blessed it with Success, that no one Book can be named, written by any *Scots* Man of either Communion, that has been so instrumental in bringing off People from a Course either of Vice or Indifferency, and in engaging them to Thoughtfulness and a Concern about their Eternal Interest, as this has been. Can then Mr *Rhind* instance wherever the *Father of Lies* was guilty of a greater than what he has alledged against that Book? No. He was self-condemned, and therefore dar'd not adventure to cite so much as one *Line* of it for verifying his Charge. But we are not to wonder at this his Conduct. For when once a Man proclaims Hostility against *Piety* in the general, He finds it necessary to *blow* upon every serious Book that tends to promote it. I thought it necessary to give these Hints by the By, that the World may see what Men They are that *separate* from the *Presbyterians*, and are received by the *Episcopal* Party.

I am now to consider His Argument as he has laid it. *First*, As to its *Weight*, and *then* as to its *Truth*.

In the *First* Place as to its *Weight*. Supposing it were true, *that the Spirit of the* Presbyterians *is diametrically opposite to that of the Gospel*, wou'd that ALONE justify a *Separation*? Mr. *Rhind* affirms it would; and positivly saies in his *penult* Page, 'That *each* 'of his Arguments *separatly* is sufficient to warrant the Change he 'has made; and as to this argument particularly, He saies p. 185. *That it might serve instead of all these He hath urged.* I affirm the Contrary; and that, even supposing its *Truth*, it cou'd not justify a *Separation*, abstracting from the Rest. The *Truth* or *Being* of a Church is never to be measured by the Manners of the Members, which may be Good and Bad at different Times, and vary as Men do. The Church of *Israel* was always, as God had fram'd it, a true Church. But if *Holiness of Life* had been made a Note of it, it might in some Junctures have been called no Church at all. When our Saviour visited the World, He cou'd scarce find any Probity,

Probity in it; and the formal Religion of the *Phariſees* had made void real and ſolid Piety. The Blood of all the *Prophets* was lying upon them, and through their own Traditions they had made void the Commandments of God. And yet, notwithſtanding all this, Chriſt did not ſeparate from them. Conſequently the like Objection cannot be a juſtifiable Ground of Separation in any other. Thus Dr *Teniſon* now Primate of all *England*, and who is at once the Honour as well as Head of his Order, Reaſon'd (*e*) againſt the *Romaniſts* urging (with the ſame Modeſty as Mr *Rhind* does) *Holineſs of Life* as a Note of their Church. And I ſuppoſe the Reaſoning will *ſtill* hold Good. It was then a very Unchriſtian Act in Mr *Rhind* to *ſeparate* from the *Presbyterians*, when his ſhining Virtue and bright Example cou'd not have fail'd to have reclaim'd 'em, or at leaſt to render 'em inexcuſable. But it is not the firſt ſad Loſs they have ſuſtained, and overcome too; as, I hope, they ſhall do this.

However, ſuppoſing the *Weight*, let us conſider the *Truth* of his Argument. This I ſhall do by examining the Particulars he inſiſts on. Having ſpent *Two* or *Three* Pages in deſcribing the *Spirit of the Goſpel*, and what he means by the *Spirit of a Party*: He alledges I. That the *Presbyterian* Spirit is *Enthuſiaſtical*. II. That it is a meer *Animal* or *Mechanical* Spirit. III. That it is a *Partial* Spirit, damning and denying Grace to all but their own Party. IV. That it is a *narrow* and *mean* Spirit. V. That it is a *malicious*, *unforgiving* Spirit. VI. That it is an *unconverſible* Spirit. VII. That it is a *Diſloyal*, *Rebellious* Spirit. VIII. That it is a Spirit of *Diviſion*. IX. That it is an *Unneighbourly*, *Cruel* and *Barbarous* Spirit.

Here is a very *formidable* Muſter; yet, after all, not very *dangerous*. For, Mr *Rhind* has been ſo well natured as not to cite ſo much as one *Line* out of any *Presbyterian* Author for proving *any* Thing of all this; Tho' that was, I'm ſure the *moſt*, perhaps the *only* habile Way of doing his Buſineſs effectually. Nay, tho' the greateſt Part of his Charge turns upon *Matter of Fact*; yet he has not cited ſo much as *one* Hiſtorian, great or ſmall, of either Side, for making it good. But ſuch is the *Epiſcopal* Way of writing, and we muſt not complain. *Harangue*

[e] On *Bellarmin's* X. Note of the Church.

rangue and *Declamation* are All-Powerfull Engines when play'd by a *Canonical* Hand: And when *They* are at so much Pains to labour Their Periods into a *Cadence*, 'tis Rudness and Ill Manners in us to ask for *Proof*, the insisting on which wou'd spoil the Harmony of their Rhetorick. However, we must crave Leave to enquire a little into the Particulars of this Charge.

I. He charges the *Presbyterians* with an *Enthusiastical* Spirit. But on what Grounds? '*1st*, *saith he* p. 200, Their most 'admired Practical Systems contain Nothing but the 'very Dreg of *Mysticism*, and a *Jargon* no less unintel- 'ligible, than that of *Jacob Behmen* or *Molino*. Well what are these *Practical Systems*? He is so far from citeing any Thing out of 'em, that he does not so much as *name* any of 'em, except the *Two* already mention'd viz. *Shepherd* & *Guthrie*. For Vindication of Mr *Guthrie*'s Book, I ask no more of any Person, but that he'll peruse it seriously; and if, after he has done, he can say there is any other *Mysticism* or *Enthusiasm* in it, than what the Gospel *teaches*; Nay, than what *every* Man who is concern'd about his Soul *feels*, I'll frankly forgive him.

The *Presbyterian* Spirit not *Enthusiastical.*

Plainly, the Import of that System is this. That the great Work every Man has to do in this World is to secure Eternal Happiness to Himself. That there are indeed some Persons blessed with the Advantage of a Religious Education; and the Grace of God falling in therewith; They are *insensibly* train'd up to Piety and Virtue, and find Themselves in a fixed Habit thereof, without being able to give a distinct Account how it began, or by what sensible Steps it has arrived at such a Height. But then the far greater Part of Baptized Persons spend a great Part of their Life either in a Course of *Vice* and *Leudness*, or at best in *Indifferency* and *Carelessness* about their Eternal Salvation. God, who is an Infinite Lover of Souls, and wills not that they shou'd perish; is graciously pleased, in His own good Time, by His Spirit, working by these Ways He has appointed, to awaken them into a thoughtfull Temper, and to alarm them of their Danger. He engages them seriously to compare their Heart and Life with the *Law* of God. And, upon the doing this, they cannot but discover a vast Contrariety and Contradiction between them. He engages them likewise

likewiſe ſeriouſly to lay to Heart the *Threatnings* of God, and the dreadfull Things His Law has awarded againſt ſuch Criminals as they are: And this cannot but affect them with the moſt *horrible Apprehenſions*. For, who can be eaſie either in Body or Mind under the *Thoughts* of having God for his Enemy; and under the *proſpect* of getting Hell for his Portion? God is pleaſed to *excerciſe* them with ſuch Thoughts, till he ſees they are duly humbled, and in Earneſt convinced that it was *a bitter and evil Thing to depart from the Living God*. But then, God does not project for the Uneaſineſs of His Creatures, nor require *Sorrow* for *Sorrow*'s Sake, but that they may be the more watchfull againſt Sin in Time comeing, and the more affected with His Goodneſs in providing a Method of Delivery for them. And therefore, when He has *Exerciſed* them ſo long and to ſuch a Height as is needfull for attaining theſe Ends upon them; He is pleaſed to begin their Relief by intimating to them, by means of the Goſpel, a *Poſſibility* of Salvation through Jeſus Chriſt. Yet even this is not ſufficient to *determine* the Soul to God. For, be the Remedy never ſo ſoveraign, yet it can do no good to ſuch as don't apply it; whether through *Deſpair*, that it will not be effectual; or through a *falſe Hope* that the Wound will not prove deadly. And therefore, yet further, God, by the Internal Operation of His Spirit, in the Way of Goſpel Means, gives a new Turn and Byaſs to the Soul, not only perſwades it that it is *poſſible* to be ſaved; and that it is abſolutly *needfull* to fall in with the Goſpel Method of Salvation; but effectually *determines* it to do ſo; ſo that the Soul *heartily* renounces *all* Sin, ſincerely engages in a Courſe of *Univerſal* Holineſs; and, in that Method, truſts to the Merit and Righteouſneſs of Chriſt *allennarly* for Acceprance with God, Pardon of Sin, and comeing to Heaven at laſt. Now, when a Perſon finds his Caſe altered thus ſo much to the better; is it poſſible but that he muſt needs *rejoice with Joy unſpeakable and full of Glory*? While he goes on in the Way of Holineſs, is it poſſible but he muſt find that *the Ways of Wiſdom are Ways of Pleaſantneſs, and Her Paths Peace?* When he is ſenſible that his Eternal Happineſs is ſecured by an Intereſt in Chriſt, is it poſſible but that he muſt *rejoice in the Hope of the Glory of God*? If at any Time he ſlack his Diligence, and fall into Sin, through the Infirmity of Nature or the Violence of Satan's

tan's Tentations, and thereupon the *Consolations of the Holy Ghost* are withdrawn, has he not the greatest Reason to be dejected both in Body and Mind, and to pray with the *Psalmist* Ps. LI. 8. 11. *Make me to hear Joy and Gladness: That the Bones which Thou hast broken may rejoice. Cast me not away from thy* Presence: *Take not Thy Holy Spirit from Me.* Or, if God, even in a *Soveraign* Way overcast His Soul; that he may long so much the more for the uninterrupted joys of Heaven; Is this any other than what the most Holy Men recorded in Scripture have felt?

This is the Import of Mr *Guthrie*'s Book, and indeed of all the other *Practical Systems* written by the *Presbyterians* on the same Subject. Is there any thing of *Enthusiasm* in all this? Any irregular Heats? Why then wou'd Mr *Rhind* adventure to expose the *internal Part* of Religion in so ludicrous a Manner as he has done? Certainly, if ever any Man was guilty of the Sin of *doing Despite unto the Spirit of Grace*, he is so. This, which I have told, is that which he calls the *Long and senseless Story of the Manner of Gods dealing with the Souls of his Elect.* These the *strange Things* they talk of their *Manifestations* and *Desertions.* This the *sudden* and *irresistible* Manner of God's influencing them by his Spirit, which Mr *Rhind* thinks so much a *Jest*; but which no Man that fears God will allow himself to think the same Way of. 'Tis true, the *determining* Turn that the Spirit of God gives to the Soul is acknowledged by the Presbyterians to be *Instantaneous*; but then They acknowledge too a great Deal of *Preparatory* Work, and Mr *Guthrie*, in particular largely insists on it: So that Mr *Rhind*'s representing the *Presbyterians* p. 193. as pleading for Conversions; attended with such Circumstances as these of *Paul* &c were, is only an Instance of that *Calumny* to which he has so intirely given up himself.

2*dly*, Another Ground, whereon Mr *Rhind* wou'd found the Charge of *Enthusiasm* against the *Presbyterians*, is, That they pretend, as he alledges p. 190, to *Illuminations* and *Raptures* and to the most *extraordinary Inspirations*; and then he falls a disputing very wightly in order to disprove their being *extraordinarly* inspired, and very frequently compares them to the *Modern Prophets* in their *Agitations.* But how does he prove that They pretend to any such Thing? No Way. He has not so much as *offered* at doing so, nor adduced *one* Syllable for that Purpose. What then is to be thought

of him and his Fellow-Writers who ordinarly talk at the same Rate? Is it not plain that they are under the Power of *Hypocondriacal* Melancholy, whereof wild and extravagant Imaginations, for which there is no Ground, are a most Infallible Symptom?

But why did Mr *Rhind* charge the *Presbyterians* with *Enthusiasm*, when his own Beloved Party had been so scandalously Guilty of it? In the *First* place, when *Enthusiasm* was in Fashion in the Time of the late Civil Wars, who were the great Masters of it? The *Presbyterians* in *Scotland* preach'd and wrote against it; but the *Episcopalians* in *England* cherished it; and some of their Clergy were the principal Writers for it, for Instance, Mr *William Erbery* who owns Himself to have been *Episcopally* ordain'd. There is a thick *Quarto* Volume of his Lucubrations extant under the Title of his *Testimony*, from which 'tis evident that *Jacob Behmen* might have gone to School to him to learn *Enthusiasm*. 2*dly*, Does not *Parker* who writes against the *Confession of Faith*, and has prefixed to it a Poem against the Synod of *Dort* and in praise of *Arminius*, and who was just such another Protestant as Mr *Rhind*, does not he, I say, avow Himself an *Enthusiast*, and recommend *Jacob Behmen* and such others as divinly inspired (*f*)? 3*dly*, Who knows not that Dr *George Garden*, one of the first Character among the *Episcopal* Clergy, is the great promoter of the *Bourignian* Principles? 4*thly*, Who were they that were mostly carried away by the *Modern Prophets* and seized with their *Agitations*? I suppose the *Episcopal* Clergy cannot purge their own Families. 5*thly*, Does not the Author of Mr *Dodwell*'s Life confess that, toward the latter Part of it, *He seemed to grow not a little Enthusiastical*? And is it possible any one can read his *Epistolary Discourse* and not be convinced of this. For Instance, when he teaches that *our Saviour preached to the Separate Souls who deceased before His Incarnation*, Sect. 41. When he teaches that *Water Baptism was given to the separate Souls of them who had no Means of obtaining it when living* Sect. 42. When he teaches that *Renunciation of the Devil was performable in the separate state by those who con'd not know their Duty before* Sect. 43. When he teaches that *the Gentiles received the Spirit by our Saviour's Baptism in their*

[*f*] Page 6, 14. &c.

thei[r] ſeparare ſtate Sect. 44. When he teaches that *the Apoſtles being themſelves deceaſed preached to the deceaſed Gentiles.* Sect. 45. Were there ever more diſtracted Notions than theſe vented in *Bedlam*? I think then it were the Wiſdom of the *Epiſcopal* Party for their own ſakes to drop the Charge of *Enthuſiaſm* againſt the *Presbyterians*. I ſhall conclude this with obſerving by the By, That Mr *Rhind* writes inaccuratly when he Yoaks *Jacob Behmen* and *Molinos* together. *Molinos's* greateſt Errors, for which He ſeems to have been ſo ſeverely perſecuted by the Church of *Rome*, were according to the beſt information the Doctrines of *Predeſtination* and its Dependencies, and his teaching People to place their Devotion rather in internal Prayer and Communion with God than in numbering their Beads (*g*): Whereas all the *Enthuſiaſts*, are mortal Enemies to the Doctrines of *Predeſtination* &c, and Mr *Poiret* owns that he levelled his *Oeconomie Divin* mainly againſt theſe Doctrines. And Dr *Garden* does the ſame in his Writings. So much for the Charge of an *Enthuſiaſtical* Spirit.

II. He Charges the *Presbyterians* with a meerly *Animal* or *Mechanical* Spirit, and that all their Hopes and Fears, Joys and Sorrows in Religion are meer *Mechaniſm*, the Effect of *Melancholy*, *Imagination* and *Animal* Impreſſions. Hear him a little p. 196. 'He '(that is, a *Presbyterian* after the Commiſſion of 'ſome grievous ſin) dreams of Nothing but of Hell and Damna- 'tion, which in the Hurry of his paſſions perhaps forces him to 'diſpatch Himſelf. But if the black Blood ſhall chance to be 'ſweetned by a Mixture of better, and if the Violence of His 'Paſſions is abated, He begins to conceive better hopes. And if 'He ſhall chance to recover from this Fever, ſo that his Blood does 'again glide after its due Manner, he concludes that all is well 'with him. Thus he and a great deal more to the ſame purpoſe.' Tis true, the *Presbyterians* own themſelves to be *compound* Beings, and that they conſiſt of *Fleſh* as well as *Spirit*, and believe that God applys

Not meerly *Animal* or *Mechanical.*

[g] See Supplement to Dr. Burnet's Travels.

applys Himself to them according to the Make of Human Nature, and discovers Infinite Wisdom and Goodness in doing so; for *He knows our Frame and remembers we are Dust.* But, because the *Animal* Affections operate Sensibly, either upon the Commission of some grievous Sin, or upon our having made Peace with God, does it therefore follow that the *Spirit* of God did not excite them? Or that, because the *inferior* and bodily Faculties do operate, therefore the *Superior* Faculties do not? Is it possible but that the Soul and Body must work mutually upon and affect each other while we are in the *embodied State*? Nay, will they not do so even after the Resurrection which is the most *perfect State*? Does He not know that a *Separate State* is a preternatural one which Sin alone has made us liable unto. The truth is, I think Mr *Rhind*, after all his Boasts, to be but very indifferently qualified to write Lectures upon the *Animal OEconomy*, and that he is a perfect Stranger to *Solon's* Precept *Nosce Teipsum*, as well as to the *Exercise* of piety. And therefore, ere he begin to write his Lectures, I cannot but recommend to him the perusal of that excellent Discourse concerning the *Mechanical Operation of the Spirit* annexed to that very pious Book called *A Tale of a Tub.* If Mr *Rhind* can recover the papers necessary for the filling up the *Lacuna* p. 303. his Business is done: For the Bookseller has assured us, that *In them the whole Scheme of Spiritual Mechanism was deduced and explained, with an Appearance of great reading and observation*; *tho' it was thought neither safe nor convenient to print them.* Such devout Books tend mightily to the promoting of Religion, and many such the Church of *England* Clergy has blessed this sinfull Age with: And it cannot but raise Mr *Rhind*'s Character to Communicate such laudable Productions of his Brethren for the Benefit of the Publick. But to go on,

If Mr *Rhind* was so great an Enemy to every thing of *Animal Exercise* in Religion, Why did He join the Church of *England*: For, of all other Protestant Churches in the World, She has aimed most at the raising the *Animal Affections* by her Way of Worship, though she is so unhappy as to attempt it by Methods which our Blessed Saviour never instituted: For what else means the Pompousness

pouſneſs of her *Service*? What elſe is deſigned by the *Cope*, *Surplice*, *Rotchet* &c? What elſe by the *Ceremonies* and all that Mimical Cringing and Bowing (ſo much practiſed in the Chapel and Cathedral Worſhip) which is below the Gravity of a Man much more of a Miniſter? Can there be any thing elſe deſigned by all this, but to bear upon the Senſes and affect the Imagination? What is the *Surplice* and all the other Sacred Accoutrments intended for, but to dazle the *Eyes*? What are the *Organs* and *ſinging Boys* deſigned for, but to charm the *Ears*? Why are the Prayers and the whole Devotions parcell'd into ſuch Shreds, but that the *Animal Part* may be gratified with Variety? Mr. *Rhind* then ought to have been aware of touching upon this Point: For, after all the Abſtraction he and his Party pretend to, the World ſees well enough that they are but Fleſh and Blood like their Neighbours.

III. He charges the *Presbyterians* with a *partial* Spirit, damning and denying Grace to all but their own Party. 'So 'few, *ſaith he* p. 191 are they to whom they allow this 'ſaving Grace, that, if we ſhall except the Apoſtles, 'and thoſe of that extraordinary Age, and St *Auguſtin*, 'They'll allow none to have been bleſſed with it, till 'it was vouchafed to ſome *Presbyterians* in the Weſt of *Scotland*, about 'a hundered Years ago, who convey'd it to their Succeſſors, and 'infected ſome of their *Engliſh* Brethren therewith. And p. 204. *They confine*, ſaith he, *the Grace of Converſion, and conſequently Election to their own Party.* This is indeed a hainous Charge. But how has he proved it? Nay not ſo much as the *leaſt* Document has he *offered* to produce for that Purpoſe. The *Epiſcopal* Veracity muſt ſtand for all. But the *Presbyterians* deny the Charge till They ſhall ſee it proved. Not a *Partial, Damning* Spirit.

In the mean Time *I* charge Mr *Rhind* and his Party with a *Partial, Damning* Spirit, and ſhall prove it ere I go further. *Firſt I* charge Mr *Rhind* with it. For, ſpeaking of the Spirit of the *Presbyterians* p. 216. He expreſly ſays that *it drives them from the Communion of the Church, and cuts them off from the ordinary Communications of the Holy Ghoſt.* Beſides, he has (as we have heard before) damned the whole *Proteſtant* Churches that want *Epiſcopal* Government. Nay, he has damned

damned the whole *Catholick* Church of Christ by declaring her Doctrines *fundamentally false and pernicious*. *Secondly*, I charge his *Party* with it. Besides many Shoals of lesser Authors, I instance, for the Purpose Mr *Dodwell* the Standard-Bearer of the *Party*. In his Book of *Schism*, the Sum of the XV *Chapter* is, That the Spirit of God is not given, nor his Graces communicated, nor Pardon of Sin bestow'd, nor Salvation to be expected without the Sacraments. The Design of his XVIII *Chapter* is to prove, That the Validity of the Sacraments depends on the Authority of the Persons by whom they are administred. The Design of his XIX *Chapter* is to prove, That no other Ministers have this Authority of administring the Sacraments but *only* they who receive their Orders in the *Episcopal* Communion. The Sum of all is, No Bishop no Minister; No Minister No Sacrament; No Sacrament no Salvation; *Ergo* no Bishop no Salvation. Or take it in his own Words (*h*) 'The alone Want of Communion 'with the Bishop makes Persons *Aliens from God and Christ*, *Strangers to the Covenant of Promise and the Common Wealth of Israel*- - -. 'They must certainly be deprived of all those real Enjoyments 'and Holy Relishes which devout Souls experience even in this Life 'in the Communion with their best Beloved. In a Word, he tells us, that on *that* Account we must want the *Comforts* of Religion here, and lose the *Hopes* of enjoing them hereafter. Say now, good Reader, if it is not modest in the *Episcopal* Party to charge the *Presbyterians* with a *Damning* Spirit. Whether Atheism, Laziness or Uxoriousness (as Mr *Rhind* alledges against the *Presbyterians*) can engage Men of Sense to entertain such *Phantastick* Principles, I shall not say: But sure I am, they come not from the Spirit of God, nor are consistent with the Peace of the Church or Nation.

IV. He charges the *Presbyterians* with a *Narrow* and *Mean* Spirit. Upon what Evidence? *1st*, 'Christ, 'saith *He*, dyed for all Men, but the *Presbyterians* confine the Merit of His Death 'to a *Predestinated Few* p. 207. I answer, The *Presbyterians* acknowledg that Christ died for *all* Men in *all* that

Not a *Narrow* or *Mean* Spirit.

[h] One Priesthood Chap. XIII. Sect. 14.

that Sense the Scripture meant ever that Expression. 'Tis true They confine the Efficacy of his Death to the *Predestinated*, and acknowledg that Christ's *Flock* (comparativly speaking) is but a *little* one; but 'tis false that they confine it to a *Few*: On the contrary, they believe the Redeemed to be past numbring, and hope, upon the Assurance of the Scripture, *Rev.* VII. 9. to *behold* one Day *a great Multitude which no Man can number, of all Nations, and Kindreds, and People, and Tongues standing before the Throne, and before the Lamb, cloathed with white Robes, and Palms in their Hands,* and Hymns in their Mouths. *2dly*, 'Christ meant, *saith he*, that his Grace should 'extend *universally*, which the Presbyterians restrain to their own 'Party. I answer. The first Part of this Charge is false Doctrine, the latter impudent Calumny. The first Part of it I say is *false Doctrine*, for which (waving other Arguments at this Time) I appeal to the Church of *England*, which, in her *Catechism*, tho' she teaches her *Catechumens* to say, *I believe in God the Son, who hath redeemed me and* all *Mankind*, yet she expresly restricts the Object of sanctifying Grace; and teaches the *Catechumen* to say, *I believe in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth Me and all the* Elect *People of God.* The latter Part of the Charge, I add, is *impudent Calumny*. The *Presbyterians* are so far from restraining Grace to their own Party, that they both believe and profess that *in every Nation he that feareth God and worketh Righteousness is accepted of him.*

But then, who knows not that *High-Church* is guilty of this *Narrowness* and Meanness of Spirit even to the last Degree of Scandal? Is it not known that They not only deny Grace to *Presbyterians*, but even confine the Church of *England* to their own Party, and reckon all such, even of the *Episcopal* Communion, *Schismaticks*, as fall in with the Government; nay, in their most solemn *Offices*, rank their Episcopal Brethren of the lower Form in the very same Class with *Pagans*. Thus, in their new Liturgy (*i*) which they formed after K. *William*'s Accession to the Throne, They prayed in Terms, *Restore to us again the Publick Worship of thy Name, the re-*

[i] See a Pamphlet entituled *Reflections upon a Form of Prayer lately set forth for the* Jacobites *of the Church of* England, printed for *Richard Baldwin*. 1690.

verent Administration of thy Sacraments: *Raise up the former Government both in Church and State, that We may be no longer without King, without Priest, without God in the World.* 3*dly*, 'Christ's Charity, '*saith he*, relieved all Men indifferently, Enemies as well as freinds 'while the Presbyterian Byas visibly sways them to favour the 'Godly, that is, those of their own Way. 'Tis answered, The *Presbyterians*, as they have Opportunity, do good unto *all* Men; tho' indeed, according to the Apostles Precept, *especially unto them who are of the Houshold of Faith*, whether of their own or any other Way; tho' no doubt, they love those of their own Way best; and I suppose all the World does the like.

In the mean while, tho' 'tis both Vain and sinfull to *boast* on this Head, yet for stopping the Mouth of Calumny, the Presbyterians are content it be put to a Trial, which of the Parties have gone furtheest in their Publick Deeds of Charity to the other in their Distress. By all the Information I can have, the *Episcopal* Clergy, during the whole 28 Years of their late Reign, never relieved any of their *Presbyterian* Brethren with so much as one shilling. The Truth is, they durst not ask it, but thought themselves happy enough, if they escaped without being relieved out of all their Miseries at once by the COMPENDIOUS Way then in Fashion: Whereas, to my certain Knowledg, the *Presbyterians* have often relieved rhe *Episcopalians*, and I hope shall always continue to do so in Imitation of their Heavenly Father who *is kind even to the Bad and the Unthankfull*, and in spite of the *Apocryphal* Prohibition *Ecclus.* XII. 5. *Give not to the Ungodly: Hold back thy bread and give it not unto him.*

Not a *Malicious* or *Unforgiving* Spirit

V. He charges Them with a *Malicious* and *Unforgiving* Spirit p. 209. so contrary to that which Our Saviour and the Blessed Martyr St *Stephen* exemplified. Well how does He qualifie or prove this Charge? Why, 'their Rebellious 'Martyrs, *saith he*, *never* expressed their Forgivness of the Injuries, 'which They thought were done them by supposed Persecuters: 'Their *last Speeches* so faithfully recorded in *Naphtali*, and so much 'admired by the party, containing rather too plain Indications of the Malice

'Malice and Rancour of their *Souls*, when they were ſtepping into Eternity. Thus he. 'Tis true, theſe *rebellious Martyrs* did not allow themſelves to die as a Fool dieth, tho, their Hands were bound and their Feet (and Legs too) were oftimes put into the moſt pinching Fetters. They boldly avowed the Cauſe for which they died, and with all Freedom told their Perſecuters of their Injuſtice and the wicked Courſe they were in. And for this Practice they had the Example of the Bleſſed Martyr *Stephen*, who treated the *Sanhedrim* with ſharper Language than any is to be found in *Napthali*. *Ye ſtiff-necked, and uncircumciſed in Heart and Ears, ye do always reſiſt the Holy Ghoſt: As your Fathers did ſo do ye. Which of the Prophets have not your Fathers perſecuted? And they have ſlain them which ſhewed before of the Coming of the Juſt One, of whom ye have been now the Betrayers and Murderers.* Acts VII. 51. 52.

But now as to the Charge it ſelf. If we ſhall find theſe *rebellious Martyrs* expreſſing their *Forgivneſs* of their Enemies: If we ſhall find them doing this in their *laſt Speeches:* If we ſhall find them doing this in their laſt Speeches recorded in *Naphtali*; will not this diſcover what a Spirit of *Truth* and *Modeſty* that is, the *Epiſcopal* Party are poſſeſſed with? Let us try it then.

The Marqueſs of *Argile* who ſuffered *May* 27. 1661. 'And, *ſaith He*, as I go to make a Reckoning to my God, I am free as to *any* of theſe Calumnies that have gone abroad of me, concerning the King's Perſon or Government. I was *real* and cordial in my *Deſires* to bring the King Home, and in my *Endeavours* for Him when He was at Home, and I had *no* Correſpondence with the Adverſary's Army, nor *any* of them, in the Time when His Majeſty was in *Scotland*; nor had I *any* Acceſſion to His late Majeſties horrid and execrable Murder, by Counſel or Knowledge of it, or *any* other Manner of Way. This is a Truth, as I ſhall anſwer to my Judge---- I deſire not that the Lord ſhould judge any Man; nor do I judge any but my Self: I wiſh, *as the Lord hath pardoned me, ſo He may pardon them* for this and other Things, and that what they have done to me, may never meet them in their Accounts.-------And I pray the Lord preſerve His Majeſty and to pour out His beſt Bleſſings on His Perſon and Government. *Naph.* Edit. 1693. p. 285. &c.

Mr *James Guthrie* Minister of the Gospel at *Sterlin* who suffered *June* 1. 1661. 'God is my Record, *saith he*, that in these things 'for which sentence of Death hath passed against me, I have a good 'Conscience. I bless God they are not Matters of Compliance with 'Sectaries, or Designs or Practices against His Majesty's Person or Go-'vernment of his Royal Father: My Heart (I bless God) is con-'scious unto *no* Disloyalty; nay, *Loyal* I have been, and I com-'mend it unto you to be *Loyal* and Obedient in the Lord. ---- 'The Mistake or Hatred or Reproach of my Enemies I do with 'all my Heart *forgive*, and wherein I have offended any of them 'do beg their Mercy and Forgivness ---- I *forgive* all Men the 'Guilt of my death, and I desire you to do so also: *Pray for 'them that persecute you, and bless them that curse you, bless I say and 'curse not.* *Ibid.* p. 291. &c.

The Lord *Warriston* who suffered *July* 22 1663. 'The good 'Lord give unto them (*His Enemies*) Repentance, *Remission* and 'Amendement; and that is the worst wish I wish them, and the 'best wish I can wish unto them. ----- I am free (as I shall now 'answer before His Tribunal) from *any* Accession by Counsel or 'Contrivance, or *any* other Way to his late Majesty's Death, or to 'their making that Change of Government: And I Pray the Lord 'to preserve our present King His Majesty, and to pour out his 'best Blessings upon His Royal Posterity. *Ibid* p. 301. &c.

Captain *Andrew Arnot* who suffered *December* 7. 1666. 'And who-'ever they be that any Way have been Instrumental or incensed 'against me to procure this Sentence against me, God *forgive* them 'and I *forgive* them. *Ibid.* p. 316. And in his *joint Testimony* which he, with *Nine* others who were put to Death the same Day with him, subscribed in Prison immediately before they were brought to the Scaffold, he and they in Terms acknowledg the King's Au-thority. 'We are, *say they*, condemned by Men, and esteemed by 'many as Rebels against the King, *whose Authority we acknowledge:* 'But this is our rejoicing the Testimony of our Conscience. *Ibid.* p. 307. &c.

Mr. *Alexander Robertson* Preacher of the Gospel, who suffered *December* 14. 1666. 'I wish that they may lay the Matter to Heart 'and repent of it, that God may *forgive* them, as I *forgive* all Men, and

'and particularly *Morton* who did apprehend me.--- And he is so far from entertaining rebellious Thoughts that he declares *There was just Reason to think, that if these rigid Oppressions had been made known to his Majesty, his Justice and Clemency wou'd have provided a Remedy. Ibid.* p. 320. &c.

Mr *Hugh M'kaile* Preacher of the Gospel who suffered *December* 22. 1666. 'I do freely *pardon* all that have Accession to my Blood, 'and wish that it be not laid to the Charge of this sinful Land, but 'that God wou'd grant Repentance to our *Rulers*, that they may ob- 'tain the same Reconciliation with Him, whereof I my self do partake. *Ibid.* p. 330 &c.

John Wilson who suffered at the same Time with Mr *M'kaile*. 'For 'my Part I pray that the Lord may bless our *King* with Blessings from 'Heaven.--- And I pray for *all* that are in Authority under his *Maje-* 'sty--I can *forgive* the Wrong done to me in taking away my Life 'for this Cause, and wish God to be mercifull to those that have con- 'demned me, or have had any Hand in my Death. *Ibid.* p. 351. &c.

Mr. *James Mitchel* while under the Torture of the Boots *Anno* 1676. 'And now my Lords, I do freely from my Heart *forgive* you who 'are Judges sitting upon the Bench, and the Men who are appointed 'to be about this Piece of horrid Work, & also these who are vitiating 'their Eyes beholding the same. And I do intreat, that God may never 'lay it to the Charge of any of you, as I beg God may be pleased 'for his Son Christ's sake to blot out my Sins and Iniquities. *Ibid.* p. 431.

James Learmont who suffered *September* 27. 1678. 'As for *Alexan-* 'der Maitland who apprehended me, my Blood lyes directly at his 'Door, who promised me then, that nothing should reach my Life, 'as he swore by Faith and Conscience, and his Brother is also 'guilty of my Blood. I *desire* the Lord to give them Repentance and 'Mercy if it be possible. *Ibid.* p. 445. And in his *Large Speech* p. 450. He thus delivers himself. 'I here most freely, before I go hence (with- 'out Desire of Revenge upon the forenamed Persons, or any other, 'who have been the Occasion of my Blood shedding, now in my last 'Words after the Example of my Lord and Master) say as is men- 'tioned in that Scripture Luke 23. 34. *And Jesus said, Father forgive* 'them, *for they know not what they do.* My dear Friends, I give my 'Testimony against that Calumny cast upon *Presbyterians*, that they

are

'Seditious and *Diſloyal* Perſons, the which Aſperſion I do abhorr. 'Therefore, I exhort all People, that they will ſhew *Loyalty* to 'the *King*, and *all* lawfull Magiſtrats, and all their juſt and law-'full Commands.

Mr. *John King* Miniſter of the Goſpel who ſuffered *Auguſt* 14. 1679. 'The Lord knows, who is the Searcher of Hearts, that 'neither my Deſign nor Practice was againſt His Majeſty's Perſon 'and juſt Government, but I always intended to be *loyal* to lawfull 'Authority in the Lord. I thank God, my heart doth not condemn 'me of any *Diſloyalty*, I have been *loyal*, and do recommend it to 'all to be Obedient to Higher Powers in the Lord.---- I bleſs the 'Lord, I can freely and frankly *forgive* all Men the Guilt of it, even 'as I deſire to be forgiven of God. *Pray for them that Perſecute 'You and Bleſs them that Curſe You. Ibid.* p. 469. 475.

John Nilſon of *Corſack* who ſuffered *December* 14. 1666. 'I 'pray that the Lord for Chriſt's Sake may freely forgive me, as I 'have *forgiven* them that have wronged me. *Ibid* p. 327.

Theſe are the *Rebellious Martyrs* recorded in *Naphtali* who *never* expreſſed the Forgivneſs of the Injuries they thought were done them. *Rebellious Martyrs* they were; for, when ſtepping into Eternity, they not only denyed and diſowned any Act of Rebellion: But ſpent their laſt Breath in praying for the *King* and in recommending *Loyalty* to their Survivers. Theſe *laſt Words* of theirs which I have cited are no doubt as good Evidence of the *Presbyterian Malice*, as their Sufferings are of the *Epiſcopal Mercy*. I cannot but wiſh that the Epiſcopal Authors wou'd retain, at leaſt, ſome *Relique* of Modeſty and not advance Things, not only *without* all Ground, but *contrary* alſo to the cleareſt and ampleſt Teſtimony. I'm ſure they cannot but be ſenſible how odious ſuch a Way of Writing muſt needs make any Party that uſes it to God and all good Men.

They very frequently inſiſt on this Topick of *Forgiving Enemies* againſt the Presbyterians; but'tis in ſuch a Way as ſufficiently diſcovers their Meaning. I remember betwixt the Year 1680 & 1688. there was no Doctrine more frequently inſiſted on from the Pulpits of *Edinburgh* than that of *Forgiving Enemies*. In the mean Time, the *Gibbet*,

Gibbet, to save Expences, was left standing in the open Street from one Mercat Day to another for hanging the *Whigs*. People were mightily puzzled for a while to reconcile the Episcopal Preaching and Practice together. At last the secret was found out; that the Meaning was, that *their* Enemies should forgive *them*; But then, that *they* shou'd forgive *their* Enemies was a different Case. They must then take the Sponge to their late Books in which they have so often libelled the *Presbyterians* on this Head, and wait till the Memory of the late Times is worn out, ere they can perswade People that *their* insisting on the *Forgivness of Enemies* is any other than most odious Affectation; just as when the *Inquisition* turns over a poor Wretch to the Secular Arm, intreating in the Bowels of Jesus Christ to be tender to Him; the Meaning of which is, that *Secular Arm* must burn the Poor Creature Quick, on Pain of Excommunication and a worse Turn besides. And is there any other Proof needfull to shew what a Jest the *Episcopal* insisting on *Forgivness of Enemies* is, than to read over Mr. *Roina*'s Book, especially the latter Part of it, which breaths pure unmixed Malice for *Thirty* Pages together, and that too which makes it so much the more Ridiculous, without the least Shadow of Truth or proof. If a Man treat me harshly, however bitter the Things may be He saies against me, yet if they are true, and He convinces me that they are so, I ought to bear with Him, and 'tis my own Fault if If don't profit by the Reproof. But if he charges me with the worst Things, without so much as offering to convince me, I contemn the Malice of the poor Impotent Thing, and cannot revenge My Self better than by suffering Him to fry in His own Grace, and prey upon his own Spleen.

VI He charges the Presbyterians p. 209. with an *Unconversible* Spirit, in that *they value themselves upon the Sullenness of their Tempers*. A very great Fault truly. For certainly Christianity is superstructed upon Humanity, and the Grace of God was intended not to destroy, but to improve and refine it. And the Apostle has expresly commanded us 1 Pet. III. 8 *Love as Brethren, be pitifull, be Courteous*: Nor does Piety ever appear more charming and engaging than when adorned with

Not an *Unconversible* Spirit.

a good Behaviour. But how does Mr. *Rhind* prove his Charge? Why, Good Reader, He does not so much as *attempt* this, nor has offered so much as one Syllable for that Purpose. Is it not then as easily denyed as affirmed. And is not the Defender, in all such odious Cases, presumed to be Innocent till the Contrary is proved. 'Tis true Our Saviour's Desire (as Mr. *Rhind* suggests) of doing Good carried Him into the Company of the Men of *loose*, as well as regular Lives, and I believe all Presbyterians, whether Ministers or others, who are piously inclin'd, are carried, by the same Desire of doing Good, into the Company of Men of loose Lives, when there is the least Hope that their doing so will not rather *harden* them *in*, than *reclaim* them *from* their Loosness. But then, That they keep at a Distance from them in their Revells, study a Precisness of Conversation, and *will not run with them to the same Excess of Riot*, however *strangly* they may be thought of on that Account; This they are so far from reckoning a Fault, that they avow it, and are sorry there is not more Ground for charging them with it. Mr. *Rhind* may call 'em *Puritans* on that Score, or give 'em what other ill Names He pleases: But then, what comforts them is, that the Apostle *Paul* was just such another *Puritan*; and not only warrants them *in*, but obliges them *to* such Precisness and Abstraction, commanding them I. *Cor.* V. 11. *With such Persons not so much as to eat.* And II. *Thess.* III. 14. *To note such Persons, and have no Company with them.* Our Blessed Saviour was such a Physician as was not in Danger of catching the Disease from the Patient. But when virtuous Persons allow themselves to haunt bad Company in their Bottle Conversation, I'm affraid it too often falls out, that they themselves are infected, and the vicious not reformed.

However, whatever *Unconvertibleness* the *Presbyterians* may be guilty of, I suppose Mr. *Rhind* might have kept at Home, and reserved His Lecture for *High-Church*: Not that they are very nice in their *Practice*; for, I believe, the best that can be said of 'em as to that is, That they are (if I may use our Country Phrase) but like Neighbour and other. But, if the Church of *England* Divines themselves may be believed, Mr. *Bisset* for Instance; The Height of their *Principle* makes them so much Enemies to the Rest of Mankind, that neither *Presbyterians* nor even *Low-Church* can walk the Streets

Streets in Safty, but are every Moment in Danger of being justled into the Kennel by *High-Church.*

Tantum Relligio potuit suadere Malorum!

But it is not this or that Man's particular Testimony we need depend on. 'Tis plain their *Principles oblige* them to such Hostility against the rest of Mankind: For, were I of Mr *Rhind*'s Faith, and believed all the same ill Things of the *Presbyterians* that he does, I wou'd not only reckon it *unlawfull* to converse with them, but I shou'd think my self *obliged* in Conscience to destroy them. If they are Schismaticks, Hereticks, and *their Spirit diametrically opposite to that of the Gospel*, &c. What shou'd Men do, but treat them as mad Dogs, knock 'em on the Head, and rid the World of such Nuisances.

VII. He charges them with a *Disloyal, Rebellious* Spirit. p. 210. I hope, every Man ought not to be believed a Rebel who has been at any Time called one. I have observed before p. 29. that Mr *Dodwell* was proclaimed a Rebel by K. *James*, yet who, for all that, believes he was such? Perhaps the *Presbyterians* will be found as Innocent.

Not a *Disloyal* or *Rebellious* Spirit.

Mr *Rhind* founds his Charge both upon their *Principles* and *Practices.*

First, upon their *Principles.* But, had he thought that any part of his Business, I suppose he wou'd have found the *Proof* of this a very hard Task. The *Principles of a Church* are to be gathered from her publick *Formula*'s. And I appeal to every Body who has read the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, and the *Thirty nine* Articles of the Church of *England*, if the *first* is not as Loyal as the *latter.* But they are *private Authors* not *publick Confessions* that Mr *Rhind* was to build on. And, for his Purpose, he *names* (for he cites nothing) *Buchanan*'s Treatise *de jure Regni*, *Rutherford*'s *Lex Rex*, *Naphthali* and the *Hind let loose.* 'Which Books, *saith he* p. 211, the Presbyterians 'have not to this Day branded with any publick Censure, tho' 'they have been often upbraided, and solemnly challenged to condemn, otherwise to be counted Abettors of them. The Answer,

I hope, will be pretty easie. The *Presbyterians* love to walk by Example, and to give Place to their Betters. Mr *Rhind* certainly knows that the Bishops and other Clergy of the Church of *England* have publish'd at least a Hundred Books and Pamphlets with the same Principles and Schemes of Government as are in *Buchanan*, *Rutherford* &c. Let the *Convocation* once condemn these, and begin with the Bishop of *Sarum*, Dr *Higden* and Mr *Hoadly*; and then possibly the *General Assembly* may write after their Copy. 'Tis certain the *Presbyterians* maintain no other Principles of Government than what the Church of *England* has practised, no other Principles than these upon which She, with the Assistance of her good Neighbours, preserved the Protestant *Religion* in 1688. I am not for prying into the Power of Princes, remembering to have read somewhere *Periculi plenum est de ijs disputare qui possunt amputare, de ijs scribere qui possunt proscribere*, but I think the Principles of our *Scots* Episcopalians are beyond the Power of all Natural Understanding to account for. *Claudius* and *Nero*, who reigned successively in the Time of writing the New Testament, were both Usurpers and Tyrants, had neither Hereditary nor Parliamentary Right; yet both the Apostles *Peter* and *Paul* enjoin'd Subjection to them, and commanded Prayers for them. Her present Majesty has both the fullest and clearest Right any Prince possibly can have. She has exercised it in the most obliging Manner, particularly with Respect to them. Now that, notwithstanding all this, they shou'd have so long refused to pray for Her, and that most of 'em shou'd do so still; this I affirm is unaccountable in Point both of Duty and Gratitude. Nor have the Actings of *High Church* in *England* been more accountable, as I hope we shall hear afterwards.

Secondly, He charges us with Disloyal *Practices. They were no sooner hatched*, saith he p. 212. *than they rebelled.* Sweet Popery! What a charming Thing art Thou; when even *Protestants*, nay those that will needs be the *only* Christians among 'em, affirm that a Reformation from *Thee* was Rebellion? But let us hear his Instances of their Rebellion?

First, He begins, where the *Reformation* began, *viz.*. at Q. *Mary*'s Reign, 'whose Reputation, *saith he*, they blackned, whose 'Authority and Government they resisted and reviled, whose *Per-*

son

'ſon they impriſoned, and whom they obliged to fly, in Hopes to 'ſave that Life which ſhe cruelly loſt. Thus He. Every Body muſt needs own that of all others the *Epiſcopal* Writers are the nimbleſt Diſputants. When we diſpute with them about the Government of the *Church* in Q. *Mary*'s Days, by no means will they allow that it was *Presbyterian*. No. *Superintendents* were the ſame Thing with *Biſhops* (*k*). Well, be it ſo: And let us diſpute a little about Loyalty in the Government of the *State*. How came it that under an *Epiſcopacy*, Q. *Mary* was ſo ill treated? Oh, now the Caſe alters, the whole Government was then in the Hands of the *Presbyterians*. Rebellion was the very Egg out of which they were hatch'd!

Quo teneam Vultus mutantem Protea nodo?

But let us ſuppoſe the Presbyterians had then the Government, What did they? Why *firſt*, ſaith he, *they blackned Her Reputation*. For Anſwer, I ask has Archbiſhop *Spotſwood* whitened it? Does not He tell the Story of Signior *Davie* much after the ſame Way with *Buchanan*? Does He not tell of the horrid abuſe the King met with at *Stirling*, how He was neither admitted to be preſent at the Baptiſm of His Son, nor ſuffered to come to the Feaſt? How the forreign Ambaſſadours were diſcharged to ſee or ſalute Him, and ſuch of the Nobility as vouchaſed him a Viſit were frown'd upon by the Court, and he at laſt diſmiſſed with a Doſe of Poiſon in his Guts. Does he not expreſly tell that the King was Murdered by *Bothwell* and the Queen's Domeſticks? Does not all the World know that Her Majeſty afterwards married the Murderer, and that too, upon a Divorce from the Lady *Jean Gordon* his wife obtain'd in the moſt Scandalous Manner? Does not *Spotſwood* I ſay relate all theſe Things? Was *Spotſwood* Presbyterian?

Nor is *Spotſwood* alone in the Relation of 'em. For, not to mention other *Scots* or *Engliſh* Hiſtorians, *Ruggerius Tritonius* Abbot of *Pignerol*, who was a Zealous Papiſt, a hearty Friend to Q. *Mary*, lived in the Time, was Secretary to *Vincentius Laureus* Cardinal *de Monte Regali*, who was ſent *Nuncio* from the Pope to the Queen for aſſiſting Her with his Counſel in the Extirpation of He-

[k] See the Fundamental Charter of *Presbytry*, with many other Authors.

resy, and was lying in *Paris* waiting for Orders from the Queen to come over into *Scotland*, at the Time when the King was murdered, and kept an exact Correspondence with the *Roman* Catholicks there: This Author, I say, thus every Way qualified for bearing Witness in this Case, expressly relates * and that with the *Permission of his Superiors*, That when the Nobility told Her Majesty, that they had taken up Arms for bringing *Bothwell* to punishment for Murdering the King &c, Her Majesty justified *Bothwell*, and told them, *He had done Nothing without her Consent.* Did then the Presbyterians Forge any of these things?

But *2dly*, saith Mr *Rhind*, *they resisted and reviled Her Authority and Government*, that is to say, they wou'd not allow Her to restore Popery, nor wou'd they commit the Young Prince to the Custody of *Bothwell* who had murder'd His Father. Were not these very unpardonable Faults?

Yet further *3dly*, Q. *Elizabeth* took off her head; and no doubt she, and her Council that advised Her to it, were staunch Presbyterians. So much for Q. *Mary*'s Reign.

Secondly, In K. *James* VI's Reign. Mr *Rhind* owns (which is very much from him) that in his Days *they did not break out into open Rebellion.* Why then, they cannot be so rebelliously disposed as He wou'd represent them: For if they had, it is not quite improbable but they might have made their own Terms of Peace: But, says Mr *Rhind*, they *Occasion'd Vexations and Disturbances to Him*; that is to say, they protected Him in his Cradle, set the Crown on his head, fought for him, and kept the Country in greater Peace, when he went to fetch home his Queen, than it had been known to be in for many Years before; which he himself acknowledged, and gave publick Thanks to God for. 'Tis true, they grudged the receiving *Bishops* and the *five* Articles of *Perth*, which he wou'd needs press upon us in Order to a Conformity with *England*. But I cannot think either *England* or we or the Royal Family cou'd have been much Losers, tho' he had never fallen into that Politick.

Before

* Interrogati quanam de causa armati illuc accessissent, non alia, respondisse feruntur, nisi, ut atrocem Injuriam a *Boduellio* factam, ac crudelem & indignam Regis necem, vimque ipsimet Reginæ illatam vindicarent. At Regina noxam *Boduelli* purgare: Nihil non ipsa assentiente commissum. *See* Vita *Vincentij Laurei* S. R. E. Cardinalis *Montis Regalis*. *Ruggerio Tritonio Pinaroli* Abbate Auctore. Impress. *Romæ* 4to apud Hæredes *Johannis Rossij* CIↃ IↃ IC Superiorum Permissu. P. 19---31.

Before I proceed to the next Reign, I must beg Leave for a short Digression, which, I hope, the Reader will the more easily excuse; that it is not so much from the Subject as from the Author; and is intended to do Justice to the Memory of the Dead, who are not in Capacity to redress themselves. The Matter is this.

The Right Honourable the Earl of *Cromerty*, very lately *viz.* in *May* last 1713. Publish'd a Book bearing this Title, AN HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE CONSPIRACIES BY THE EARLS OF *GOWRY*, AND *ROBERT LOGAN* OF *RESTALRIG*, AGAINST K. *JAMES* VI. Therein (*Preface* p. VIII.) His Lordship writes thus

'As to Truth in my Present Subject, the Malicious Designers, a-'gainst the *Royal Family* in *Scotland*, did at first invent, and then 'foment, a most improbable Falshood, making it their Business to 'suggest, that *Gowrie* and His Brother did never Conspire against 'the King; But that the King did Murder them both. This was 'invented and clandestinely propagated by *Bruce*, *Rollock*, *Dury*, '*Melvil* and other *Presbyterian* Ministers. Thus His Lordship.

'Tis hugely afflicting to the *Presbyterians* to find their Forefathers represented, by a Person of His Lordship's Figure, under the Odious Character of MALICIOUS DESIGNERS AGAINST THE ROYAL FAMILY. What is usually advanced against 'em by the Common Herd of *Episcopal* Writers they can securely contemn: For, why shou'd that give them any *Concern*, which their Enemies Blurt out without any *Care*? But such a Charge from His Lordship cuts 'em to the Heart, and wou'd leave 'em Inconsolable, were it not that (as kind Providence wou'd have it) they find His Lordship's much weightier Affairs have hurried Him into some Mistakes; which, they make no Doubt, He will rectifie upon Advertisement; which I now humbly crave Leave to give.

In the *First* Place, As for Mr. *Rollock*. That He did neither Invent nor clandestinely Propagate such a Story, as His Lordship alledges, 'tis certain. By this Token, that Mr. *Rollock* was Dead, and

and Rotten too, before the *Conſpiracy*. Every one knows that *Gowry*'s Conſpiracy fell out *Auguſt* 5*th* 1600. But Mr. *Rollock* died in the Moneth of *February* 1598. Thus *Clerk* relates in His *Life*. Thus *Melchior Adams* relates in his *Lives of Forreign Divines*. Thus the Manuſcript *Calderwood* in the Univerſity Library in *Glaſgow* relates. Nay thus *Spotſwood* relates in his Hiſtory p. 454. And thus, I preſume, every Body, elſe relates, that writes of Mr. *Rollock*.

For preventing Miſtakes I muſt advertiſe the Reader, that, as *Spotſwood* informs us p. 456, the Year among us uſed to begin at 25 *March*, till a Publick Ordinance was made, appointing that the Beginning of the Year 1600, and ſo on thence forward, ſhou'd be reckon'd from the firſt of *January* as now. 'Tis then no Objection againſt what I have advanced, tho' one find Mr. *Rollock* writing Books, or ſpoken of in Hiſtory as living, in *January* or *February* 1599. The different Ways of Computation quite remove that Difficulty. And tho' Hiſtorians differ about the Day of the Moneth on which He died; *Spotſwood* making it the *laſt* Day of February, whereas all the reſt, whom I have ſeen, make it the *eighth* Day of that Moneth: Yet, that is not of any Import in this Caſe: For, even by the loweſt Account, He was Dead at leaſt *ſeventeen* Moneths before the *Conſpiracy*; and therefore cou'd not, without a Miracle, Invent or Propagate falſe Stories concerning it.

2*dly*, His Lordſhip is in the like Miſtake concerning Mr. *Dury*. For He died, as *Spotſwood* alſo relates p. 457, upon the *laſt* Day of *February* 1600, that is to ſay, *five* Moneths and *five* Days before the *Conſpiracy*, and ſo could not be Guilty.

Theſe Obſerves, concerning *Rollock* and *Dury*, the Publick owes, not to me; but, to that Worthy Perſon and my very good Friend Mr. *Matthew Crawfurd* Miniſter at *Inchenan* in the Shire of *Renfrew*; who, in an accidental Converſation, firſt gave Me Notice of His Lordſhip's Book, and that He had obſerved the ſaid Miſtakes in it. Which Obſerves, upon Examination, I found to be Juſt.

His Lordſhip is not only out as to His reckoning, but is miſtaken alſo in the Characters of the Men: For, they were ſo far from being DESIGNERS AGAINST THE ROYAL FAMILY; that, as *Spotſwood* relates in the Places above cited, they ſpent their laſt Breath,

Breath, *Rollock*, in exhorting His Brethren in the Miniſtry to carry dutifully towards the King; and *Dury*, in adviſing them to comply with His Majeſty's Deſigns for reſtoring *Prelacy*.

I don't in the leaſt incline to aggravate theſe his Lordſhips Miſtakes. So much the leſs, that I find 'tis uſual with great Men, when writing againſt the *Presbyterians*, to fall into the like. The famous Monſieur *Varillas* very gravely tells it as a Singularity * concerning *Buchanan*, that, *After having declared himſelf againſt his Sovereign Lady, ſo far as to go into* England *to depoſe againſt Her in the Criminal Proceſs then depending, he continued to perſecute her after ſhe was beheaded. This*, ſaith he, *is a Crime which they, who are moſt partial in Favour of* Buchanan, *muſt own he was guilty of*. And yet after all this, 'tis certain, that *Buchanan* was not guilty of that Crime, for this good Reaſon, that he died ſome three or four Years before the Queen was beheaded. But there is a ſhort and obvious Apology to be made for ſuch Miſtakes in *Varillas* or his Lordſhip, *Aquila non captat Muſcas*. To go on.

3*dly*, As to Mr *Melvil*. 'Tis true he was on Life at that Time, yet I cannot find in any Hiſtory that he was guilty of Inventing, Fomenting, or Propagating ſuch a Story, or that he made any the leaſt Noiſe about that Matter. His Lordſhip therefore wou'd oblige his Country, if he wou'd vouchaſe to give his Authors.

4*thly*, As to Mr *Bruce*. 'Tis true, he refuſed to give publick Thanks for the King's Deliverance from that Conſpiracy, declaring, as *Spotſwood* p. 461 relates, that *he wou'd reverence His Majeſty's Reports of that Accident, but could not ſay he was perſwaded of the Truth of it*: For which he was baniſh'd the King's Dominions, and went into *France*. But this is a very different Thing from what his Lordſhip charges him with. For, to ſuggeſt, *that Gowry and his Brother did never conſpire againſt the King, but that the King did murder them both*, had been a *Crime*; becauſe it was not poſſible, certainly to know that; and yet much leſs, to prove ſuch a Suggeſtion. But to declare, that *he could not ſay that he was perſwaded of the Truth of the Conſpiracy*, which is all that the Hiſtorians of that Time charge him with, was, at the worſe, but a *Weakneſs*; it not being in a Man's Power to believe a Story,

* Preface to the V. Tom. of the *Hiſtoire de L' Hereſie*.

ry, but according to the Impreſſion which the Grounds of it, and Credibility of its Circumſtances, make upon his Mind. And no one knows better than his Lordſhip, that there are ſeveral Circumſtances, in the Story of the *Conſpiracy*, which are not ſo perfectly clear, but that they require Time to believe 'em: Tho' indeed, I think his Majeſty's Teſtimony, with the Preſumption that the Earl and his Brother were out of their Wits, as his Majeſty, before the Attempt, ſuſpected the Earl's Brother to be, is ſufficient to determine the Matter. For what may not mad Men do? However it was, it does not appear that Mr *Bruce* was guilty of what his Lordſhip charges him with; there being a very great Odds betwixt Contradicting a Report, and being reverently ſilent about it.

5*thly*, As for *other Presbyterian Miniſters* whom his Lordſhip indefinitly involves in the ſame Guilt. The Accuſation can be of no Weight till his Lordſhip is pleaſed to name them. 'Tis true the Miniſters of *Edinburgh*, *viz.* Mrs. *Walter Balcanqual*, *William Watſon*, *James Balfour*, and *John Hall*, demurr'd at firſt to give Thanks for the King's Deliverance, upon this Excuſe, as *Spotſwood* p. 461. informs us, that, *they were not acquainted with the Particulars, nor how thoſe Things had fall'n out.* But how ſoon they were inform'd of the Particulars of the Conſpiracy, they complyed. Now, implicite Faith having been cried down, ever ſince the Reformation, it ſeems hard to blame ſuch a Conduct: And 'tis no leſs hard to blame *Presbyterian* Miniſters for a Fault which was common to ſo many others at that Time; *Spotſwood* telling us that *many doubted that there had been any ſuch Conſpiracy.* This may be ſufficient for Vindication of the *Presbyterian* Miniſters againſt his Lordſhip's Charge. I crave Leave only to add two Remarks more on his Lordſhips Book.

I. His Lordſhip p. 30, 31. has advanced a Piece of Hiſtory in theſe Words. 'Upon the Information of *Henderſon*, and other 'Witneſſes, *Cranſton* and *Craigengelt* were pannell'd before the 'Juſticiary at *St. Johnſtoun*; and upon clear Teſtimonies, and on 'their own Confeſſion at the Bar (which they alſo adhered to 'on the Scaffold) they were both executed: Only alledging that 'they did not know of the Deſign to Murder the King; but that 'they intended to force the King to make great Reparations for the

'the late Earl of *Gowrie's* Death; and that this Earl of *Gowry* was 'to be made a great Man. Thus his Lordſhip.

But His Lordſhip has not thought fit to Document this; and *Spotſwood* who lived in the Time has flatly contradicted it in theſe Words p. 459 'Another of *Gowrie's* Servants ſurnamed *Craigengelt* was 'ſome two days after apprehended, and both he and M. *Tho.* 'Cranſton executed at *Perth*; tho' at their dying they declared that 'they knew NOTHING of the Earl's purpoſe, and had ONLY 'followed him as being their Maſter unto that Room, where if they 'had known the King to have been, they wou'd have ſtood for him 'againſt their Maſter and all others. Thus *Spotſwood.* I dont for all this ſay, that the Earl of *Cromerty* is wrong: But if he is not, certainly the Archbiſhop is.

II. His Lordſhip has alſo given us in his Book a large and particular Account of the *Proceſs* and *Trial* of *Robert Logan* of *Reſtalrig*. No one will ſuſpect His Lordſhip's Exactneſs in the Extracts of the Documents of that Proceſs which He has produced. But tho' His Lordſhip's Faithfullneſs is beyond Queſtion, yet the Truth of the ſtory it ſelf is not. I ſhall give my Reaſon why I ſay ſo.

Spotſwood was at that Time at Man's Age, was Archbiſhop of *Glaſgow*, was one of His Majeſty's Privy-Council, was upon the Scaffold when *Sprot* the Notary, from whom that whole Proceſs flow'd, was hang'd, and ſigns the Account of *Sprot's* Behaviour on the Scaffold, which we have p. 115 of His Lordſhip's Book: *Spotſwood*, I ſay, who was thus every way qualified to give Judgment upon and a true Narration of this *Proceſs*; Yet, in his Hiſtory, tells the ſtory in ſuch a Manner, as wou'd tempt any Body ſhrewdly to ſuſpect, that the whole Buſineſs was a Fiction. For thus His Words are p. 509.

'Whether or not I ſhould mention the Arraignment and Execu'tion of *George Sprot* Notary in *Eymouth*, who ſuffered at *Edin'burgh* in the *Auguſt* preceeding, I am doubtfull; his Confeſſion, 'though voluntary and Conſtant carrying SMALL PROBABI'LITY. This Man had deponed, that He knew *Robert Logan* of 'Reſtalrig, who was dead two years before, to have been privy 'to *Gowrie's* Conſpiracy, and that he underſtood ſo much by a 'Letter that fell in his hand written by *Reſtalrig* to *Gowrie*, bearing

'that he would take part with Him in the Revenge of his Father's 'Death, and that his beſt Courſe ſhou'd be to bring the King by 'Sea to *Faſcaſtle*, where He might be ſafely kept, till advertiſement 'came from thoſe with whom the Earl kept Intelligence. It ſeem-'ed a VERY FICTION, and to be a MEER INVENTION of 'the Man's own Brain; for neither did he ſhew the Letter, nor 'cou'd ANY WISE MAN think that *Gowry*, who went about 'that Treaſon ſo ſecretly, would have communicated the Matter 'with ſuch a Man as this *Reſtalrig* was known to be. --- Thus far His Grace, who, as we are told in his Life, *had not only the Uſe of all the Regiſters both of Church and State in Scotland, but of all Letters of State that cou'd any way concern the Work he was about.* And yet his account not only differs from his Lordſhip's, but plainly contradicts it. 'Tis certain then there muſt be a Miſtake ſomewhere, which I muſt leave to the Reader to judge upon as he liſts.

I do not deſign by theſe two Remarks to derogate in the leaſt from the Truth of the *Conſpiracy*. For, in the Light wherein it now ſtands, I cannot conceive why any man ſhou'd ſuſpect it. The Earl of *Gowry* uſed the *Black Art*, wore *Magicall* Spells in his Girdle, which His Lordſhip himſelf was once Maſter of, and has very well proved in his *Letter* to his *Printer* prefix'd to his Book. What Crime was not ſuch a Perſon capable of? His Brother's whole Conduct in the Managment of the Conſpiracy ſpeaks him Frantick. For *1ſt*, That he ſhou'd have ſhut up *Henderſon* in the Chamber in order to perpetrate the Murder, and yet not have told him before hand that this was the Deſign. *2dly*, That after having held the Whinger to the King's Breaſt, he ſhou'd have fall'n a parlying with him, and gone down ſtairs to conſult with the Earl his Brother whether he ſhou'd murder Him or not. *3dly*, That he ſhou'd have taken the King's Promiſe not to open the Window or cry out till he ſhou'd return. *4thly*, That when he had return'd and ſworn *BY GOD there is no Remedy, you muſt die*; he ſhou'd have eſſay'd to tye the King's Hands with a Garter, when, 'tis probable, he might have more eaſily diſpatch'd Him without that Ceremony. Cou'd there be greater Symptoms of a Man Diſtemper'd in his Wits than theſe and a great many other Circumſtances that might be added? Why then ſhou'd we any

longer

longer doubt whether a Man in *Compact* and his Brother *Non Compos* wou'd attempt the greateſt Villany?

But then, both the Earl and his Brother had always, till that very Day, paſs'd under the Character of Wiſe, Sober and Virtuous Gentlemen, *two Youths of great Hope*, ſays *Spotſwood*, *at whoſe Hands no Man cou'd have expected ſuch an Attempt.* Was it any Wonder then if Mr. *Bruce*, and the other Miniſters of *Edinburgh* who demurr'd a little, cou'd not at firſt Daſh be perſwaded, that they had all of a ſudden become, the One of 'em a Devil, t'other Diſtracted? 'Tis plain there was a Difficulty here: And this is more than enough to vindicate the *Presbyterian* Miniſters. *Quod erat Faciendum.*

I go on with Mr. *Rhind*, and proceed to conſider His Charge of *Rebellion.*

Thirdly, In K. *Charles* I's Time, I believe there is no wiſe Man will undertake to juſtify all that was done on either Side during thoſe Troubles. The only Queſtion is, who were the firſt Authors of them, and who gave the greateſt cauſe of them?

Was it the *Scots Presbyterians*? My Lord *Hollis* has aſſolzied 'em. 'Twas propoſed, *ſaith he* (*l*) that our Brethren of *Scotland* might 'be called in, who were known to be a wiſe People, Lovers of 'Order, *firm to the Monarchy*: Who had twice before gone through 'the Misfortune of taking up Arms, and wiſely had laid them 'down again; ſtill contenting themſelves with that which was *ne-'ceſſary* for their Security, avoiding Extremities. Their Wiſdom 'and Moderation, as was preſumed, might then have delivered 'us from that Precipice of Miſery and Confuſion, into which our 'Charioteers were hurrying us amain. But theſe Men would none 'of it at that Time. Thus his Lordſhip.

Were not the *Scots Prelates* the firſt Authors of thoſe Troubles? Did not they *raiſe the Fire*? Yes. *Gilbert Burnet* has expreſly loaded them with it (*m*). 'Tis true, that Perſon has made a vigorious Appearance theſe *twenty* or *thirty* Years bygone againſt *Popery*, and in Behalf

[l] Memoirs p. 11. [m] Memoirs of the Houſe of *Hamilton* p. 29. 30. &c.

of the *Proteſtant* Intereſt, which is a Fault never to be forgiven, in this World or in the next, if ſome Mens Doom hold: And, on that Score, any Teſtimony he cou'd give *now*, ſince he was Biſhop of *Sarum*, cou'd be of no Weight. But this Teſtimony he gave when he was plain *Gilbert Burnet*, and was as through pac'd in the Principles of *Paſſive Obedience* and *Non-reſiſtance* as ever Mr *Dodwell* was, or Mr *Leſly* is. Plainly he tells, That the *Scots* Biſhops, by reflecting on the *Reformers*, commending the Perſons, and mollifying the Opinions of *Papiſts*, defending the *Arminian* Tenets, advancing a Liturgy without Law, provoking the Nobility by engroſſing the King's Favour, crying down the Morality of the Sabbath and prophaneing it by their Practices, making themſelves unſupportable to the Miniſtry by *Simoniacal* Pactions and encroaching upon their Juriſdictions, by relinquiſhing their Dioceſſes and medling in all ſecular Affairs, and by adviſing the King to introduce Innovations into the Church without Conſent of the Clergy. By theſe and ſuch like Things, ſaith he, the *Scots* Prelates *raiſed that Fire* in the Nation which was not ſo eaſily extinguiſhed.

Is there any other Account to be brought from *England*? No. Thoſe of the greateſt Character and moſt unſhaken Loyalty have told the Story as to that Kingdom the very ſame Way. I ſhall produce two of them for the Purpoſe. The firſt is the Lord *Falkland* in his Speech before cited before the Houſe of Commons, than which a more exact Piece of Eloquence with ſuch rigid Truth even Ancient *Rome* Herſelf cannot boaſt of. 'Mr. Speaker, *ſaith He*, He 'is a great ſtranger in Iſrael who knows not that this Kingdom 'hath long laboured under many and great Oppreſſions both in 'Religion and Liberty. And His Acquaintance here is not great, 'or his Ingenuity leſs, who doth not both know and acknowledge 'that a *great* if not a *Principal* Cauſe of both theſe have been 'ſome *Biſhops* and their Adherents.——The Reader may peruſe the Reſt at His Leiſure. To Him let us add My Lord *Clarendon*, an avowed Enemy to the *Presbyterians*, an Author who hardly ever allows Himſelf to ſpeak one good Word of any *Scots* Man; and who, even when He has the brighteſt Characters of our Nation a drawing, yet lays on the Shadowing ſo thick, that the Piece appears but a very indifferent one: Even this Noble Hiſtorian, I ſay, has expreſly charged the Troubles of thoſe Times upon the unac-

countable

countable and fiery Measures of the *Court* and *High-Church* Party. ' No less *unjust* Projects of *all* Kinds, *saith He* (*n*), many *ridiculous*, many *Scandalous*, all very *grievous* were set on Foot. The ' Council-Chamber and Star-Chamber held for Honourable that ' which pleased, and for just that which profited; and being the ' same Persons in several Rooms grew both Courts of Law to determine Right, and Courts of Revenue to bring in Money to the ' Treasury. The Council-Table by Proclamation enjoining to the ' People what was not injoined by the Law, and prohibiting what was ' not prohibited; and the Star Chamber censuring the Breach of ' those Proclamations by very large Fines and Imprisonment. And p. 223. That ' there were very few Persons of Quality who had ' not suffered or been perplexed by the Weight and Fear of these ' Judgments and Censures; and that no Man cou'd Hope to ' be longer free from the Inquisition of that Court than he resolved to submit to *extraordinary* Courses. So much for the *Court*.

Was *High Church* more Innocent? No, on the contrary She was the great Spring of all. The same Lord *Clarendon* owns (*o*) That ' when *Laud* was made Archbishop (which was in 1633) ' it was a Time of great Ease and Tranquility: The King had ' made Himself Superior to all those Difficulties He had to contend ' with, and was now reverenced by all His Neighbours; the general Temper and Humour of the Kingdom little inclined to the ' *Papist* and less to the *Puritan*. ---The Church was not repined ' at, nor the least Inclination shewn to alter the Government or Discipline thereof, or to Change the Doctrine; nor was there at that ' Time any considerable Number of Persons of any valuable Condition throughout the Kingdom who did wish either.

' * *And the Cause of so prodigious a Change in so few Years* * *N. B.* ' *after was too visible from the Effects.* The Archbishop's ' Heart was set upon the Advancement of the Church &c.---He never abated any Thing of His Severity and Rigour towards Men ' of all Conditions or in the Sharpness of His Language and Expressions.--- And that He entertain'd too much Prejudice to some Persons

[n] Hist. Rebell. B. I. p. 54. 55. [o] Ubi Supra p. 61. 71.

'Perſons as if they were Enemies to the Diſcipline of the Church, 'becauſe they concurred with *Calvin* in ſome Doctrinal Points, 'when they abhorred His Diſcipline, and reverenced the Govern-'ment of the Church, and prayed for its Peace with as much 'Zeal and Fervency as any in the Kingdom, as they made mani-'feſt in their Lives and in their Sufferings with it and for it. Thus He, and a great deal more to the ſame Purpoſe, for which any Body may conſult the Hiſtory it ſelf. Say now, Good Reader, who were the firſt and greateſt Cauſes of the Troubles in K. *Charles* I's Time?

But ſays Mr. *Rhind, They betrayed Him into the hands of his Enemies, when He had entruſted them with His ſacred Perſon.* Let us hear my Lord *Holles* upon this p. 68. 'The Wiſdom of the *Scotiſh* 'Nation foreſaw the Inconveniences which muſt have neceſſarly 'followed had they been poſſitive at that Time, how they had play-'ed their Enemies Game to their own Ruin, and even Ruin to His 'Majeſty. Therefore they made for him the beſt Conditions they 'could, that is *for the ſafty and Honour of His Perſon*, and to avoid 'greater miſchiefs were neceſſitated to leave Him in *England* and 'ſo march away. Here then the very Mouth of Iniquity was ſtopt, 'malice it ſelf had *Nothing* to ſay to give the *leaſt* Blemiſh to the 'Faithfullneſs and Reality of the Kingdom of *Scotland.* Thus he.

Mr. *Rhind* urges, that *They entered into the* Solemn League and Covenant, *and in Purſuance of the deſign thereof brought Matters to that Paſs that the King's Death was unavoidable.* That the *Engliſh* Sectarians intended the *Solemn League* for Nothing elſe but a Decoy I firmly believe. 'Tis plain that They, with *Cromwell* their Ring-Leader, were as very Villains as ever trode God's Earth, ſince the Days of *Judas.* But that the *Scots* entered into it upon the moſt Sincere and laudable Deſigns, the ſaid Lord *Holles* has amply teſtify-ed. And that it was not the *Scots* entering into, but the *Engliſh* breaking of that *League* that was the Cauſe of the King's Death is manifeſt as Light. And therefore the *Scots* juſtly reproached them with Breach of *Covenant* in all that they intended or acted againſt the King's Perſon.

Thus, in the Paper of the 5th of *July*, 1648, which was given

in

in to the Speaker of the House of *Commons* the Commissioners for the Kingdom of *Scotland* declared 'that they wou'd endeavour 'that the Rights and Priviledges of Parliament may be preserved, 'that there be no Change in the Fundamental Government, and 'that there be *no Harm, Injury or Violence offered to His Majest's 'Person*, the very *Thought* whereof the Kingdom of Scotland hath 'always *abhorred*, as may appear by all their Proceedings and De-'clarations: And the Houses of Parliament have often upon se-'veral Occasions expressed a Detestation thereof in their Declara-'tions. Wherefore we do expect that there shall be no proceed-'ing against His Person, which cannot but continue and increase 'the great Distractions of these Kingdoms, and involve us in ma-'ny Difficulties, Miseries and Confusions. Thus They. And according to this *Declaration* they made their *Protest*. Again

The Comissioners of the *General Assembly Jan.* 16. 1649. emitted their *Necessary and Solemn Testimony* against the Proceedings of the Sectaries wherein they have these Words. 'If after so many 'Publick Professions and Solemn Attestations to the contrary, 'the Foundation shall be razed, *Monarchy* be destroyed, 'and Parliaments subverted by an Imaginary and preten-'ded Agreement of the People: As it wou'd destroy the *League* and 'Covenant, and cause the Adversary to Blaspheme and insult, so it 'cannot but be the Cause of many Miseries and Calamities unto 'these Kingdoms. Thus they. Once more.

Upon the 18 of *January* 1649. The *Estates of Parliament* gave a *Return* upon the said *Testimony* wherein we have these Words. 'Therefore the Estates of Parliament, after diligent Enquiry at *all* 'the Members of this Court, *upon their publick and solemn Oath* both 'concerning themselves and others, do declare and can assure their 'Brethren of *England*, that they cannot find that either this King-'dom or *any* Person thereof had *any* Knowledge of or Accession unto 'the late Proceedings of the *English* Army in Relation to the King's 'Person or the Houses and restrained Members thereof, but are very 'Confident there is *no* Ground for such Aspersions. Thus they. And accordingly they Instantly instructed their Commissioners that they should enter, in the Name of this Kingdom, their Dissent & Protest, *That as this Nation is free from all Knowledge of and Accession to these Designs*

and

and Practices, so they may be free of all the Calamities, Miseries and Confusions which may follow thereupon to these Distracted Kingdoms.

These are the most Publick and substantial Evidences that possibly can be brought to document any Matter of Fact, and will I hope be allowed to be of somewhat more Weight, than the furious Declamations of Mr *Rhind* and such others of the like Veracity, who stick to assert Nothing, and yet cite not to prove any thing. So much for K. *Charles* I's Time.

Fourthly in K. *Charles* II's Time. After the *English* had murdered the Father, the *Scots* proclaimed His Son King, invited him Home, crown'd and fought for him. And what thanks got they? Why the *Caviliers* were glad that They had left so many of their Carcases at *Dumbar* and *Worcester*. And Mr. *L---ly* speaking of the *Sectarians* (*p*) 'They bang'd, *saith he*, the *Presbyterians* heartily at *Dumbar* whose Word that Day was The COVENANT, 'the best Victory ever the King lost. Yet so obstinate were they in their Loyalty, that when the King had fled beyond Sea, and they were oppress'd with a raging Enemy in their Bowels, yet they still continued to own him, their Ministers prayed for him even in the Face of the *English* Forces, and encouraged and assisted General *Monk* to bring him home; and all this, notwithstanding they might have had their own Terms from *Cromwell* when he was in *Scotland*, in Case they wou'd have submitted. So untrue is it what Mr *Rhind* says, that *They were serving their own private Ends.*

But *says he*, They made the *Act of the West Kirk*, wherein they de' clared, that *They wou'd not own him nor his Interest otherwise than* ' *with a Subordination to God, and so far as he own'd and prosecuted the* ' *Cause of God, and disclaimed his and his Fathers Opposition to the Work* ' *of God and the Covenant.* Well. And was this a Cause why Mr *Rhind* should *separate* from the *Presbyterians*? With what Conscience then cou'd he join with the Church of *England*? 'Tis within the Memory of Man that the Prince of *Orange* came over to *England* in Opposition to K. *James*, and that upon the Invitation of the Lords *Spiritual* as well as Temporal. He sent his Declaration before him containing the

[p] Cassandra. Numb. I. p. 60.

the Reasons and Intent of his coming. The King foresaw what a Storm was brewing, and how heavy it was like to fall on his Head. He called for the *Bishops*, and desired of 'em a Paper under their Hands in *Abhorrence* of the *Prince*'s intended Invasion. Did they comply with this Desire? No. They, even the Loyal and afterwards Nonjuring Bishops, the Bishops who had carried the Doctrine of Loyalty to such an extravagant Height as had deluded the King into all those false steps of Government which ruin'd Him, even They, I say, flatly refused his desire; Yes, They refused it *when He besought them in the Anguish of his soul.* The *Episcopalians* are desired, always, when they tell the Story of the *Westkirk* Act, to tell this too as a Counterpart to it. *Salmasius* wrote false in the Case of King *Charles* I. when He wrote *that the Presbyterians bound and the Independents killed the* Sacrifice. Even *Milton* His Adversary, tho, a bitter Enemy of the *Presbyterians*, has observed (*q*) that, in saying so, He has contradicted Himself, having elsewhere wholly loaded the *Independents* with it. But 'tis plain beyond Denial, that in the Case of K. *James*, the *Episcopalians* both *bound* and *killed* the Sacrifice. For, *To be deposed and after live*, is something worse than Death. I am fully perswaded that what they did was absolutely necessary for preserving the Protestant Religion. But then 'tis a very immodest Thing in them to upbraid the *Presbyterians* with such Acts as themselves were guilty of. But to go on with K. *Charles* II's Reign.

'Tis true that a small Handfull of People, enraged with the most horrid Oppression, made an Insurrection first in the Year 1666 at *Pentland*, and afterwards in the Year 1679 at *Bothwell*. But *first* to exasperate Men with Cruel Usage, and *then* to upbraid them for resenting it, is the utmost Barbarity the most spitefull Nature can be guilty of, and that they were thus exasperated, simply upon the Account of Nonconformity, before the Rising at *Pentland*, I referr for Proof to a small Tract entituled *A short Memorial of the Grievances and sufferings of the* Presbyterians *in* Scotland *since the year* 1660. But indeed we need not referr to any *Book*, there are many Thousands yet living who remember it to their Cost.

[q] Defensio pro Populo Anglicano. Cap. X.

So much for K. *Charles* II's Time, and as much as is neceſſary for K. *James* VII's Time.

In the Preſent and Preceeding Reigns Mr. *Rhind* Himſelf cannot charge them with Rebellion; but He falls a *Propheſying* that they wou'd Rebell if put to the Trial, and if their Intereſt did not oblige them to live in Peace. This is one of His *Viſionary Flights*, ſo neceſſary to make up *Dryden*'s Character of the Engliſh *Corah*

Some future Truths are mingled in His Book,
And where the Witneſs fail'd, the Prophet Spoke.

But if Mr. *Rhind* act the *Prophet* upon the *Presbyterians*, may not I act the *Hiſtorian* upon the *Epiſcopalians*. I gave a Hint before of their new Liturgy. Now hear their *Interceſſion* in it. *We pray Thee to be Gracious to our Prince, who for the Sins both of Prieſts and People, is now kept out. --- Raiſe Him Friends abroad, convert or confound the Hearts of His Enemies at Home. --- And by the ſecret Windings and Powerfull Workings of thy Providence, make the Stone which theſe fooliſh Builders have rejected, the Head Stone of the Corner.* Was not this a very loyall Prayer? And has not their Practice been agreeable? For, whence all the Inſurrections under *Dundee*, *Cannon* and *Buchan*? Whence the *Aſſaſſination Plot* againſt K. *William*? I doubt not, but They'll affirm all thoſe Efforts were acts of Loyalty, and ſo I'm ſure the worſt of Rebells generally Excuſe themſelves. Even Satan himſelf does not uſually ſhew His Horns or put forth his cloven Foot. But enough of this part of the charge. And to conclude it, 'tis very true, the *Presbyterians* do not aſcribe an unlimited *Power* to any Prince on Earth. And, for my own Part, I freely declare, that an unlimited *Power*, without an unlimited *Wiſdom* to direct it, and an unlimited *Goodneſs* to qualifie it, raiſes a more frightfull *Idea* in Me than is that of the Devil himſelf. Let the *Epiſcopal* Party make as much of this as they ever can.

Not a Spirit of *Diviſion*

VIII. He charges Them p. 216. with a Spirit of *Diviſion, which*, ſaith He, *drives them from the Communion of the Church, and cuts them off from the ordinary Communications of the Holy Ghoſt*. For Anſwer, 'tis true it drives them from the Communion of Mr. *Rhind*'s Church: And I hope a Mercifull God will ſtill keep Them and every good

good Christian from such a Communion; a Communion, as I have shewen, so absolutly void of the Spirit of Charity, that we are as sure 'tis not the Spirit of Christ by which they are acted, as we are sure that Christ the Son of God taught Charity. And 'better it 'were (as Archbishop *Tillotson* has most truly taught)(*r*) there 'were no reveal'd Religion, and that Human Nature were left 'to the Conduct of its own principles and Inclinations, which are 'much more mild and mercifull, much more for the Peace and 'Happiness of Human Society; than to be acted by a Religion that 'inspires Men with so vile a Fury and prompts them to commit 'such Outrages. This then is the only Answer needs be given, That the more the Spirit of Presbytry drives People from Mr. *Rhind*'s Church, the more it drives them into the Church of Christ.

He adds further That, *this their Spirit throws them (like the Demoniack in the Gospel) sometimes into the fire and oft into the Water.* By this I suppose He means that they are sometimes divided among themselves, which indeed in the former Times of Presbytry was too true, and I believe They all desire to be humbled for it before God; and I hope the present Generation will make so good a Use of the Failings of their Fathers as to keep united among themselves *henceforth*, as they have done *hitherto* to the great Mortification of their Adversaries. The best of Men will differ in some Things both as to Judgment and Practice. But I hope we shall never *differ* so far as to *divide.*

Non eadem sentire Bonos de rebus ijsdem
Incolumi licuit semper Amicitia.

In the mean Time it is shameless immodest in a Man that pretends to have join'd the Church of *England*, to upbraid the *Presbyterians* with their *Divisions.* For pray what has *Low-Church* and *High Church* been doing these Score of Years bypast, but damning each other, and separating from other? What have the Upper and Lower Houses of *Convocation* been doing, but managing a

[r] *Tillotson*'s Serm. Vol. III. p. 19.

Civil War in the moſt furious Manner, the latter accuſing the former of *Treachery*, and the former upbraiding the latter with Eccleſiaſticall *Rebellion*? If Mr. Rhind knows Nothing of this, I recommend to his Peruſal the Books cited on the Margin (*s*).

---- *Tantæne animis cœleſtibus iræ* ?

IX. In the laſt Place, He charges the *Presbyterians* p. 216, 217, with an Unneighbourly, Cruel and Barbarous Spirit,

Not an *Unneighbourly, Cruel* or *Barbarous Spirit.*

'That they ſlander their Catholick Neighbours, exert their ill Nature in a ſpecial Manner againſt their Eccleſiaſtical Superiors, pry into their Lives, and aggravate their Frailties, gladly hearken to, readily believe, and zealouſly propagate the moſt idle, falſe and malicious Stories of them. I know no other Anſwer this needs, but that it is an idle, falſe and malicious Repreſentation: And when he ſubjoins his *Proof*, it will be Time enough to make a more particular Reply.

In the mean Time he hints at *Five* Things which are to be taken ſome Notice of *viz.* 1*ſt*, the Conduct of the *General Aſſembly* in 1638. 2*dly*, The Attempts made upon the Lives of Biſhops. 3*dly*, The bar-

---

[s] Rights of an *Engliſh* Convocation. Reflections on that Book. The Authority of Chriſtian Princes over their Eccleſiaſtical Synods. Appeal to all the true Members of the Church of *England* in Behalf of the Kings Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy. Anſwer to that Appeal. The Rights, Liberties and Authorities of the Chriſtian Church aſſerted. Eccleſiaſtical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations in the Church of *England* hiſtorically ſtated. The Principles of Mr. *Atterbury*'s Book conſidered. Remarks upon the Temper of the late Writers about Convocations. Occaſional Letter on the Subject of *Engliſh* Convocations. A Letter to a Friend in the Country concerning the Proceedings of the preſent Convocation. The Power of the lower Houſe of Convocation to adjourn it ſelf vindicated from the Miſrepreſentations of a late Paper. Narrative of the Proceedings of the lower Houſe of Convocation relating to Prorogations and Adjournments. The Right of the Archbiſhop to continue or prorogue the whole Convocation. Vindication of the Proceedings of the Members of the lower Houſe with Relation to the Archbiſhop's Prorogation of it. Letter to a Clergy Man in the Country concerning the Choice of Members &c. The Caſe of the *Premunientes* conſider'd. Third Letter to a Clergy Man in the Country in Defence of what was ſaid in the two former about the Entry of the Parliament Writ in The Journals of the Convocation &c. Hiſtory of the Convocation 1700. Hiſtory of the *Engliſh* Councils and Convocations; and of the Clergys ſitting in Parliament. A faithfull Account of what paſſed in the Convocation in three Letters. An Expedient propoſed. Narrative of the lower Houſe vindicated from the Exceptions of a Letter *intit.* The Right of the Archbiſhop to continue or prorogue the whole Convocation. Vindication continued. Reconciling Letter upon the late Difference about Convocational Rights and Proceedings. Faithfull Accounts. The preſent State of Convocation, in a Letter. The Caſe of the *Schedule* ſtated. The *Schedule* reviewed. The Parliamentary Original and Rights of the lower Houſe of Convocation cleared. *Synodus Anglicana.* The New-Danger of Presbytry. A ſhort State of ſome preſent Queſtions in Convocation. A Summary Defence of the lower Houſe of Convocation. A Letter from a Convocation-Man in *Ireland* to a Convocation Man in *England.* The State of the Church and Clergy of *England* in their Councils, Synods, Convocations &c. *Cum multis aliis.*

barbarous Murder of that *Venerable old Man* the Archbiſhop of *St. Andrews.* 4*thly*, The Rabbling ſo many Miniſters at the *Revolution.* And *laſtly*, The Depoſing ſo many of them by the Church Judicatories. Theſe are the particular Grounds of his Charge, and I ſhall conſider each of 'em in Order.

Firſt. As for the Conduct of the *General Aſſembly* Anno 1638. He complains that *They trode under Foot the Biſhops of the Church, and pretended to excommunicate them, while they were without the Communion of the Church themſelves.* To which 'tis anſwered 1*ſt*, That they themſelves cou'd not be *without the Communion of the Church* even by Mr *Rhind*'s own Principles: For, they were generally, if not all of 'em, *Epiſcopally* ordain'd, and no Sentence had as yet paſt againſt them declaring them *Schiſmaticks*, when they Depoſed all, and Excommunicate the moſt Part of the Biſhops. 2*dly*, That they had juſt Reaſon to depoſe, and upon their Obſtinacy to Excommunicate them, *Gilbert Burnet* has aſſured us. For, if they were guilty of crying down the Morality of the Sabbath, and prophaning it by their Practices; if they were guilty of *Simoniacal* Pactions, of relinquiſhing their Dioceſſes and introducing Innovations without Law, without Conſent of the Church; who can be ſo harden'd as to deny that ſuch Perſons were juſtly dealt with? How cou'd they be *Governours* of the Church who were not worthy to be Members of it?

Secondly, As to *the Attempts made by them upon the Lives of Biſhops.* I ſuppoſe he means by this *Mitchel*'s wounding the Biſhop of *Orkney* in the Arm with a Piſtol ſhot *Anno* 1668. It was no doubt a moſt unjuſtifiable Act. But is the Body of the *Presbyterians* to be charged with it? Hear himſelf in his Letter after he was ſentenced to die. 'I adven-'tured on it, *ſaith he* (*t*), from my own *pure* and proper Motion with-'out the Inſtigation of *any*, yea without ſo much as the *Privity* of *any* 'of that Party; whom therefore, I earneſtly deſire that none may 'charge with it. And if any ſhall, I do with Confidence averr, that 'they deal with them *moſt unjuſtly.* Thus he. This, I hope, is ſufficient to vindicate the *Presbyterians.* Mr *Rhind* is deſired to vindicate the *Epiſcopalians* in taking his Life upon his Extrajudicial Con-

[*t*] Napthali p. 410.

Confeſſion, after he had emitted it upon the publick Faith that it ſhould not be brought in Judgment againſt him.

Thirdly. As to *the Murder of that venerable old Man the Archbiſhop of* St Andrews. 'Tis acknowledged that the killing of him (whoever did it) was Murder, and a moſt barbarous Murder. But I crave Leave to put in a Word *firſt* upon the Biſhop's Character. *Secondly*, upon the Weight of the Argument, ſuppoſing *Presbyterians* had been the Murderers. And *Thirdly* upon the Truth of that Alledgance.

As for the *Firſt* viz. The Biſhop's *Character*. 'Tis true he was an Old Man: There is no denying of it, and therefore the Fact was the more inexcuſable. Nor ſhall we grudge him the Stile of *Venerable*. *In Titulis Honorarijs non eſt Falſitas.* Why may not even a *Feſtus* be called *Moſt Noble*? But then as to the Moral Part of his Character, I ſuppoſe his beſt Friends cannot deny but that he was guilty of the greateſt *Perfidy* a Man cou'd be guilty of. The Queſtion now is not, Whether *Prelacy* or *Presbytry* be the righter Government; but whether *Treachery under Truſt* be a Vice or a Virtue, a Crime or Commendable Practice. If Mr *Sharp* was under Convictions that the *Presbyterians* were wrong, and thereupon had deſign'd to revolt from them; as no Body cou'd have hindered him, ſo no Body cou'd have blamed him any further than ſome Hundreds of his Brethren who did the ſame. But to undertake the Management of the whole *Presbyterian* Intereſt which was then lying at Stake, to give the moſt ſolemn Promiſes to be faithfull in it; yea, to take their Money for bearing his Charges in that Service; and yet after all, inſtead of managing that, to manage over the *Primacy* to himſelf; this was ſo very Foul an Act, that as I'm ſure it cannot be juſtified, ſo I doubt if it can be paralleled.

Whether he was guilty of other Things which were afterwards laid to his Charge, I ſhall not ſay: But I hope I may be allowed to tell a Story which Church of *England* Men have publiſhed to the World. Mr *L--ly* has given the World an Account (*v*) of a certain Hiſtory yet unpubliſhed, and therefore called by him *The Secret Hiſtory*, but by the Author himſelf *The Hiſtory of his own Time.* This *Secret* Hiſtorian, who was no *Presbyterian*, but of an eminent Cha-

[v] Caſſandra Numb. II. p. 29.

Character in the Church of *England* tells us, ‘ That one of the Mur-
‘ derers fired a Piſtol at the Biſhop which burned his Coat and Gown,
‘ but the Shot did not go into his Body, upon which a Report was af-
‘ terwards ſpread, that he had purchaſed a *Magical Secret* for ſecuring
‘ him againſt Shot, and his Murderers gave it out that there were
‘ very ſuſpicious Things found in a *Purſe* about him. This was the
‘ diſmal Fate of that unhappy Man who certainly needed a little more
‘ Time to have fitted him for an unchangeable State. But I wou'd
‘ fain hope that he had all his Puniſhment in that terrible Concluſion
‘ of his Life. Thus far the *Secret Hiſtorian* as reported by Mr *L--ly.*

2dly, Suppoſing *Presbyterians* had been the Murderers, Of what *Weight* would that Alledgance be againſt the Body of that Communion, or againſt the *Presbyterian* Principles? How many ill Things are done every Day in every Nation by Profeſſed Chriſtians? But were it juſt to load the whole Chriſtian Church with them, or to impute them to the Spirit of Chriſtianity? It is equally unjuſt to load *Presbytry* with the Biſhop's Murder. And ſo much the more, that the *Secret Hiſtorian* juſt now cited tells us, *that the Murderers* (who ever they were) *had not reſolved on doing this any Time before; but, ſeeing His Coach appear alone in the Moor, they took their Reſolution all on a ſudden.* But

3dly, Is it *true* that *Presbyterians* were the Murderers? Mr *L-- ly* tells us (*x*) of a *Narrative* that was publiſhed ſhortly after commiting the Fact, wherein it is ſaid ‘ That *Five* of their Accomplices,
‘ Complotters and Abettors of the Murder choſe to die, and to be
‘ hung up in Chains upon the place, rather than confeſs the Sinfull-
‘ neſs of the Action by acknowledging it was Murder or a Sin.
This I ſuppoſe is the beſt Evidence for charging the Fact upon the *Presbyterians,* and Mr *L-- ly* triumphs upon it. Now, 'tis very true there were *Five* Men put to Death on *Magus Moor* (where the Biſhop was Murdered) on that Account, and all the *Five* own'd themſelves *Presbyterians.* But now let us hear them in their laſt Words, while they were upon, or at the Foot of the Ladder, juſt a ſtepping into Eternity.

Andrew Sword. ‘ The Biſhop of *St Andrews* Death I am free
‘ of, having lived four or five Score of Miles from this, and *never*
was

[*x*] Ibid. ubi ſupra.

'was in this Place before: neither did I *ever* see a Bishop in the Face that I knew to be a Bishop.

James Wood. 'As for our coming here upon the Account of the 'Bishop's Death: For my own Part, I was *never* in this Place of 'the Country before; neither ever saw I a Bishop in my life, that I cou'd say there was the Man.

John Waddel. 'As for my Accession to the Bishop's Death where-'fore we are sentenced to die in this Place, I declare I was *never* 'Over the Water of *Forth* in this Country before this Time.

Thomas Brown. 'Some of you may judge our dying and hanging 'here is upon the Account of the Bishop's Death, and that I was 'accessary thereunto. But I must tell you as to that, that I was '*never* in this Country before this Time.

John Clyde. 'I shall say no more but only two or three Words 'anent the Thing I was accused of by those that pursued me, and 'that was the King's Advocate and Bishop *Sharp*'s Brother, anent 'the Bishop's Killing. ---- I wish the Lord may not lay it to 'their Charge. For I *never* saw that Man whom They called 'the Bishop of *St Andrews* that I knew by another Man.

Thus these *Five* Men who ventured their Eternity upon their Innocence as to the Bishop's Death. Whether the *Episcopalians* can purge themselves of their Innocent Blood, I leave it to their own Consciences. So much for the *Presbyterians* Barbarous Usage of Bishops.

But can *High-Church* purge Her self of using Bishops Barbarously? Who then were they that assaulted the Bishop of *Worcester*, broke His Coach Windows, pelted, abused, and put him in Danger of his Life? Does not the forecited Mr. *Bisset* tell us p. 8. that it was *High-Church*. Who was it call'd Archbishop *Grindall* a *perfidious Prelate* from the Pulpit. Is Dr. *Sacheverell* a Presbyterian? Who was it wrote all the scurrilous Lampoons against Bishop *Burnet* viz. *Salt for the Leach. Sham Sermon dissected. Good old Cause. Proper Defence. Evil be Thou my Good!* Is Mr. *L--ly* Presbyterian? Who is it affirms *That the Spirit of Grace is conferred in Baptism after a Manner which neither Bishop* Burnet *nor the Author of the* Dialogues between the Curate and the Country-Man *knows any Thing of*?

Is

Is Mr. *Barclay* Presbyterian *(y)*? Who says *that all that* Bishop Burnet *preached in* 1688. *was not Gospel*? Is Mr. G---n Presbyterian? But I shou'd never come to an End, shou'd I touch upon every Thing *High-Church* has both said of, and done to Bishops these *Score* of Years bypast. Had Mr. *Rhind* then no Shame to charge *us* with the Abusing of Bishops? Let such as have abused them be all reckon'd *Presbyterians*, and I'm sure we shall be *fifty thousand* stronger than we are ordinarly reckon'd to be. But I proceed.

Fourthly, As to the *Rabbling* so many of their Clergy in the Beginning of the *Revolution*. 'Tis true, some of them were *Rabbled* out, and no Man can or ought to undertake to Justify the Rabble in doing so. But had not the Clergy exasperated them to the greatest Height? How often had the Government, upon their Delation, or by their Instigation, driven the poor People's Cattle, shut up their Shops, spoil'd their Goods, imprison'd their Persons, squeezed the Marrow out of their Bones with *Boots* and *Thumbkins*, Hang'd up their Husbands, Fathers, Brothers, and other Relations, and all this upon the Account of *Nonconformity*? 'Tis true, the People ought to have forgiven them all these Injuries, as indeed generally they did. But was it to be expected, but that *Corruption* in some of 'em wou'd prevail over *Principle*, or, that, upon a Turn of Affairs, their Resentment wou'd not vent it self against the Authors of these Injuries? I don't talk without book when I say the *Clergy* were the Authors of these Injuries. No. Dr. *Canaries* will Justify me beyond the need of other Documents, which yet might be produced by Hundreds. The *Doctor*, when lately return'd from *Rome*, Published in the Year 1684. a Book entituled *A Discourse representing the Sufficient Manifestation of the Will of God* &c, which He Dedicated to the Earl of *Perth* then *Chancellour*: Therein p. 187. He draws the *Presbyterians* in all the odious Characters that Malice cou'd devise, as *light and wild Extravagants, the very Dregs and Feculency of Mankind, on the Account both of their Birth and Breeding, but especialy so, because of their very Souls and Immoralities; as being such a Herd of dull and untractable and whineing and debaucht Animals as scarcely go beyond those of the Hogs and Goats, which ever any of*

[y] See *Barclay's* Perfuasive p. 149. 150.

them was ever born for to attend. Thus He. Now when he had thus dreſſed them up in the Skins of Brutes, was it not natural that the next ſtep ſhou'd be to ſet the Dogs at 'em to worry 'em? Yes, that He does with a Witneſs. He is at ſo much Pains to Smooth over all the Severities of the Government againſt them, that he reckons *Hanging* it ſelf but a Triffle. *The Worſt*, ſays he p. 192, *is to be flung over a Ladder, or for one's Neck to be tyed to a Beam, and then to have a Sledge driven out under Him.* Was there ever a clearer Comment than this upon *Solomon*'s Words *The tender Mercies of the Wicked are Cruel?* Was it any Wonder that People were Irritated againſt ſuch *Furies?* As the Clergy *then* excited the Government to thoſe Severities, ſo they have juſtified them *ever ſince*, and complain'd that our Princes were too Mercifull. Thus Mr. *Rhind* in His *Sermon on Loyalty* Preached and Printed 1711. ſpeaking of K. *Charles* I. *Others again* (ſaith he p. 49, 50) *find Fault with His too great Clemency and Indulgence; and truly I muſt own that* THIS *was his Fault: And indeed there is* TOO MUCH *of it in the Blood of his Family* --; Of ſuch a Goſpel Strain are the *Epiſcopal* Sermons!

But why are the *Presbyterians alone* charged with *Rabbling*? Do the *Epiſcopalians* know nothing of that Trade? Did Mr *Rhind* never hear of *Sacheverell*'s Mobs, and the burning doun the *Diſſenter's* Meeting-Houſes? Did he never hear of the *Rabbling* Mr *Tullidaff* at *Errol* May 10, 1691? Did he never hear of the *Rabble* at *Old-Deer* (z)? Did he never hear of the *Epiſcopal* Treatment of Mr *Chiſholm* in *March* 1711 ſent to read the *Presbytry's* Edict for planting the vacant Church of *Gearloch* (a)? No *Pagan* Hiſtory can furniſh ſuch an Inſtance of Barbarity. But why do I inſiſt on Particulars? Even under K. *William*'s Reign, their *Rabblings* were ſo frequent, that the Parliament found it needfull to make a very ſtrict *Act* againſt them (b). And even notwithſtanding that, They are ſtill continued with the greateſt Inſolence, wherever they can hope to make any Hand with them. Is it not modeſt then in the *Epiſcopalians*

[z] See the preſent State of Parties. p. 181. [a] See State of Parties. p. 171. [b] See Act 11. Seſs. 7. Parl. K. *William*.

lians to object Rabling to the *Presbyterians*? In the *Episcopalians*, I say, who *persecute* while they are *in*, and *Rabble* when they are *out*.

Lastly, As to the Deposing so many of their Clergy by Church Judicatories. Let us hear Dr *Edwards* an Eminent Divine of the Church of *England* in his Sermon on the *Union*, concerning the present establish'd Church of *Scotland*. 'They have, *saith he*, with 'the Patience of *Confessors* and *Martyrs* (and such a great Num-'ber of them were) born the sufferings which the *High-Church* 'Men brought upon them, and now when they are able to reta-'liate, they study not Revenge, but let the World see, they can '*forgive* as well as *suffer*. This Testimony is of some more Weight than Mr *Rhina's* malicious Insinuations. I suppose the *Presbyterians* will be able to defend themselves upon a Condescendence on Particulars. In the mean Time the difference between the *Episcopal* and *Presbyterian* Conduct in this is pretty remarkable. In the Year 1662, *three hundred* Presbyterian Ministers were Turned out of their Churches simply upon the Account of *Nonconformity*, because they wou'd not receive *Collation* from the Bishop (upon a *Presentation* from the *Patron*) without any other Fault proven or alledged against them. At the *Revolution* there was not *one* Man of the *Episcopal* Clergy either *deprived* or *deposed* upon the Account of his Principle concerning Church Government. Say, Good Reader, which of these two Ways of acting was the more Christian and accountable? At the *Restauration*, not one Man, that I can hear of, was left in Possession of any Church in *Scotland*, who either had not *Episcopal* Orders, or at least received *Collation* from the Bishop. At the *Revolution* above *two Hundred* of the *Episcopal* Clergy were still continued in their Charges, many of which are alive, and in Possession at this Day, tho' in many Places Insolent to the last Degree in their Behaviour against the Establish'd Church. So that, if those who were still kept in, those who voluntarily dimitted, those who were deprived by the *Council* upon the Account of their Disloyalty, those who were outed by Act of Parliament *April.* 25. 1690 *Restoring the Presbyterian Ministers who were thrust from their Charges since the first of* January 1661: when all these I say are deduced, with those that complyed, and, upon doing so, were assumed, I suppose the Number of the *Deposed* will appear very small. And if

Mr

Mr *Rhind* can prove them to have been innocent, I doubt not but He will oblige them and his whole Party. Let me only add, that a ſevere Treatment of Miniſters is the Thing in the World a Church of *England-Man* ſhou'd be moſt loath to upbraid others with, as knowing how eaſie it is to reply. Were not *three hundred* Miniſters depoſed, deprived, excommunicated, impriſon'd or baniſhed in *two* Years Time after the Conference at *Hampton Court* 1603 ſimply for Nonconformity to the Liturgy, tho' otherwiſe they were *Epiſcopally* ordain'd (*c*)? Were not *two Thouſand* Miniſters ejected at once by the *Bartholemew* Act 1662 (*d*)? All the *Proteſtant* Churches in *Europe* put together cannot, I ſuppoſe, furniſh ſo many Inſtances of Miniſters deprived or depoſed on any Account whatſoever, as *England* can for ſimple *Nonconformity* to Prelacy and paultry Ceremonies. Tho' then the depoſing or depriving of Clergy-Men might have tempted Mr *Rhind* to ſeparate from the *Presbyterians*, yet had not his *Affection* been much more *partial*, than his *Conſcience* was *nice*, He had never been, on that Account, ſway'd to the *Epiſcopal* ſide, which has been vaſtly more guilty. So much for the *Unneighbourly*, *Cruel* and *Barbarous* Spirit of the *Presbyterians*.

Thus I have gone through all the Particulars of Mr *Rhind*'s Charge, wherein he eſſays to make the *Presbyterian* Spirit *diametrically* oppoſite to that of the Goſpel. Every Reader, I ſuppoſe, will eaſily diſcern the Difference 'twixt his *Accuſation* and my *Defence*. The *Accuſation* (tho' that is always an odious Part) is neither qualified nor proven. The *Defence* is made good, and the *Charge* diſproved from the very Books the *Accuſer* appeals to, or by the Teſtimony of the moſt eminent *Epiſcopalians*.

And now to come to an End, who can but pity Mr *Rhind*? Who, beſides the *SCHISM*, *HERESY*, and *SUPERSTITION* he has run into, has brought himſelf under the crying Guilt of the moſt wretched *PROPHANENESS* and *IMPIETY* againſt GOD, and the moſt malicious *CALUMNY* againſt his Neighbours and Benefactors. I heartily

[c] Vide Alt. Damaſc. Preſat. [d] See Dr. *Calamy*'s Account.

heartily wish he may *Repent of this his Wickedness, and pray GOD, if perhaps the Thoughts of his Heart may be forgiven him.*

UPON the whole I conclude, that the *PRESBYTERIAN GOVERNMENT* is of Divine Institution. Their *ARTICLES OF FAITH* taught by the Scripture, and believed by the Catholick Church. Their *WORSHIP* Pure and Perfect in all Essentials. And their *SPIRIT* and *Practice* at least as becoming the Gospel as that of their Neighbours.

THE END.

THE CONTENTS.

The INTRODUCTION P. 1.

CHAP. I.

Containing *Preliminary* Remarks P. 2.

SECT. I.

Containing *Remarks* on the Title of Mr *Rhind*'s Book. Ib. Remark I. That the Title of an *APOLOGY* was ill choſen, the Book it ſelf wanting the Apoſtolick Requiſits of an *Apology* viz. *Meekneſs* and *Fear*. Ib. This proved from his Character of the *Presbyterians*, which is ſhewn to be *Malicious* p. 3. *Falſe* p. 3, 4. Truly and indeed the Character of *High Church*. p. 4, 5. Remark II. Upon his concealing what Church it is whoſe Communion he has embraced. p. 5. Proved, That there is no Church on Earth whoſe Communion he can in Reaſon claim to. p. 5---11.

SECT. II.

Containing *Remarks* on Mr. *Rhind*'s Preface p. 11.

Remark I. On the Date and Motive of his ſeparating from the *Presbyterians*. Ib. Remark II. On his oun Character of his Book p. 13. Its true Character, *Vanity* Ib. *Dogmaticalneſs*. p. 14. *Profaneneſs* Ib. Remark III. On his beſpeaking Civil Uſage for himſelf p. 15. Remark IV. Whether Mr *Rhind* is the true Author of the *Apology* Ib. See alſo the *Preface*. p. 7.

SECT. III.

Containing *Remarks* on his *Narrative* of the *Manner* how he ſeparated from the *Presbyterians* p. 16.

Remark I. Demonſtrated that his *Narrative* is pure Poeſy p. 16---20. Remark II. The dreadfull Conſequences (upon his oun *Principles*) of his having been baptiz'd by a *Presbyterian* Miniſter p. 21. Remark III. That he does not aſcribe to GOD his ſeparating from the *Presbyterians* p. 22. Remark IV. On his mentioning his Obligations to the *Presbyterians* Ib. Remark V.

That

The Contents

That he refuſed the Communion of the Church of *Rome* on a Quarrel which equally obliges him to refuſe Communion with the Church of *England*. p. 23. Remark VI. Upon his charging the *Presbyterians* with Want of Reſpect to the *Fathers* p. 24. Remark VII. Upon his Character of the *Epiſcopal* Authors p. 26. Remark VIII. Character of Mr. *Dodwell* p. 27. and of Mr. *Sage* p. 31.

A ſhort *Digreſſion* on the late *Vindication* of the *Fundamental Charter of Presbytry* p. 32.

Chap II.

MR. *Rhind*'s firſt Reaſon for *ſeparating* from the *Presbyterians* viz. That they are *Schiſmaticks* in point of *Government*, Examin'd. p. 36.

SECT. I.

His Principles and Corollaries examin'd. Ib. They are not admitted by the *Presbyterians* p. 37. Much leſs by the Church of *England* p. 38. Proved, That if the *Presbyterians* are *Schiſmaticks*, *eo ipſo* it will follow that they are not without the Church. p. 41.

SECT. II.

His State of the Debate 'twixt the *Presbyterians* and *Epiſcopalians* Examin'd. p. 43.

SECT. III.

His Arguments for *Prelacy* ſumm'd up. p. 47.

SECT. IV.

His Arguments for proving that *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* were under a *Neceſſity* of Inſtituting a *Prelatick* Form of Government Examin'd. p. 48.

ART. I. His Argument from the *Nature of the Thing* for proving that *Neceſſity*, Examin'd. p. 49.

Proved that the Argument 1*ſt*, is not *Modeſt* p. 50. 2*dly*, not *Secure*, Ib. 3*dly*, that it is *impertinent* as he has laid it p. 51. His Inforcement of that Argument 1*ſt*, from the *Britiſh* Monarchy p. 51. 2*dly*, from the Principles of the *Presbyterians* p. 53. 3*dly*, From their *Practice* p. 55. The *Presbyterian* Plat Form juſtified from the *Roman Senate*, the two Houſes of *Parliament* and the Court of *Seſſion* in *Scotland*, p. 59.

ART. II. The Argument from the Form of Government in the *Jewiſh* Church for proving that *Neceſſity*, Examin'd p. 60.

Proved,

Proved, that as he has laid it, it is horridly *Impious* p. 61. that his Managment of it againſt the *Presbyterians* is Ridiculous p. 62. That it is in it ſelf weak, and concludes Nothing to the Purpoſe in this Controverſy p. 64. That if it conclude at all it concludes for an univerſal *Papacy* p. 65. That it is rejected as *Inſufficient* by the *Epiſcopal* Authors p. 67.

ART. III. The Argument from *Political Conſiderations* in Compliance with the *Jews* and *Romans* for proving that *Neceſſity*, Examin'd. p. 69.

Proved 1*ſt*, as to the *Jews* p. 70. 2*dly*, as to the *Romans* p. 71. that the Argument ſo far as it concludes makes directly for *Presbytry*. The Deſign of the Argument from *Political Neceſſity* diſcovered p. 73.

SECT. V.

The Proofs for evincing that *Prelacy* actually was inſtituted, Examin'd. p. 73.

The Inſtitution of it not to be found in the *Scripture* confeſſed by Mr. *Dodwell* p. 74.

ART. I. The Proof for evincing that *Prelacy* obtain'd in *Chriſt*'s days, Examin'd p. 75.

Proved that then the *Chriſtians* were under no Form of Church-Government diſtinct from the *Jewiſh* Ib. That neither the XII nor the LXX were *Church Officers* till after Chriſt's Reſurrection; Or, ſuppoſing they had been ſuch, that yet they had both the ſame Power. p. 77.

The Text *Matth.* XX. 25. *The Princes of the Gentiles* &c. largely vindicated p. 79.

ART. II. The Proof for evincing that P*relacy* obtain'd in the Days of the Apoſtles, Examin'd. p. 87.

Proved that if the Government which at firſt obtain'd among Chriſtians as ſuch was unalterable (as Mr. *Rhind* ſays it was) then *Prelacy* is ruin'd, Ib. Mr *Rhind*'s General Reaſonings from the *Acts* and *Epiſtles* Examin'd. p. 88. A Succeſſion in the *Apoſtolate* clearly diſproved p. 90. Harangues againſt *Parity* how ridiculous p. 98. The Civil War amongſt the *Epiſcopal* Authors p. 99. The Demonſtration for *Prelacy* from its being confirm'd by *Miracles*, Examin'd p. 100. See alſo p. 93, 94.

ART.

ART. III. The Argument from the *Episcopacy* of *Timothy* and *Titus*, Examin'd p, 103.

Proved from Scripture that they were extraordinary *Officers* p. 104. Mr *Dodwell* confesses it, p. 105. The *Postscripts* no proof Ib. The *Ancients* of the three first Centuries perfectly silent of their being *Bishops*. p. 106. Their *Episcopacy* cannot be inferred from any Thing in the *Epistles* directed to them. p. 107

ART. IV. The Proof from the *Apocalyptick Angels* Examin'd. p, 110. Those *Angels* not the fixed *Bishops* of these Churches p. 111. Not numbred by *Seven* Ib. Not Characterized as single Persons confessed by Dr *More* and Mr *Dodwell* and proved at large from the II. and III. Chap. of the *Rev.* p. 112. Proved to be False, that all Ancient and Modern *Commentators* have supposed these *Angels* to be single persons and the Governours of the Churches p. 118. *Beza* has said nothing on this Argument that favours the *Episcopal* Cause p. 120. Dr *Hammond*'s Scheme intirely ruins this Argument Ib. as it also does the argument from the *Jewish* Priesthood, and from the Subordination of the LXX to the XII. This noticed and confessed by Dr *Whitby*. p. 121.

ART. V. The Testimonies for *Prelacy* from *Antiquity* Examin'd. p. 121. Dr *Bedell* and *Medina* confess the *Fathers* to be on the *Presbyterian* Side Ib. Dr *Sherlock*'s and *Chillingworth*'s Judgment of the weight of the Testimony of the *Fathers* p. 122.

Ignatius's *Epistles* discoursed p. 123. Proved in four particulars that they quite destroy the Modern *Episcopacy* and the Principles on which it is built. Ib. Proved that as to the main of the Controversy they contain nothing contrary to the *Presbyterian* Scheme. p. 126. No Evidence that the *Ignatian Presbyters* did Preach or administer the Sacraments p. 128. Proved that the *Ignatian Epistles* are either not *Genuine*; or at least are *vitiated* and *Interpolated*. p. 132.

Clemens Romanus gives no Testimony for *Prelacy* p. 144.

Nor the Emperour *Adrian*. p 147.

Nor *Irenæus* p 148.

Nor *Tertullian* p 150.

ART. VI. The Argument for *Prelacy* from the *Impossibility* of its ob-

obtaining so early and universally, if it had not been of *Divine Institution* Examin'd p 151.

Proved that such an *Impossibility* cannot be inferred either 1*st*, From the *Piety* and *Zeal* of the *Primitive* Times p. 152. Nor 2*dly*, from the *Universal* spread of *Episcopacy* p 154. Nor 3*dly*, from the *Vigilance* of the Governours of the Church p 155. Nor 4*thly*, from the *Unparallel'dness* of the Case p. 156. Nor 5*thly*, from the *No-Opposition* was made to the Change p 157.

Testimonies for *Presbytry* from *Antiquity* p 159.

From *Clemens Romanus* Ib. *Ignatius* p 160. *Polycarp* p 161. *Justin Martyr* Ib. *Irenæus* Ib. *Tertullian* p 162. *Clemens Alexandrinus*. ib. *Origen* p. 163. *Gregorius Thaumaturgus*. p. 164. *Cyprian*. Ib. *Basilius Magnus* p. 165. *Aerius*. Ib. *Ambrose*. p. 166. *Chrysostom*. Ib. *Augustin*. p. 167. *Theodoret*. Ib. *Primasius*. Ib *Sedulius*. p. 168. *Concilium Hispalense 2dum*, Ib. *Theophylact*. Ib. *Oecumenius*. Ib. *The Canon Law*. p. 169. *Jerom*. Ib.

The Exceptions against *Jerom's* Testimony examin'd, p. 171.

SECT. VI.

Mr *Rhind's* Reasonings against the *Presbyterian Ruling Elders and Deacons*, Examin'd. p. 175.

ART. I. His Reasonings against the *Presbyterian Ruling Elders* Examin'd p. 176

ART. II. His Reasonings against the *Presbyterian Deacons*, Examin'd. p, 185.

THE *CONCLUSION* OF THE CHAPTER CONCERNING *CHURCH-GOVERNMENT*. p. 187.

An *Address* to the Gentlemen of *High-Church* Principles shewing the Uncharitableness of them, and how destructive they are of the whole *Protestant* Interest through the World, p. 188. Their confidence upon their Principles so much the less tolerable that they are Groundless. p. 192.

Chap. *III.*

MR *Rhind's* Second Reason for *Separating* from the *Presbyterians*, viz. *That their Articles of Faith are fundamentally False and Pernicious*, Examin'd. p. 196.

Sect.

The Contents.

SECT. I.

Mr *Rhind's* Objections against their Articles of *Faith* Consider'd p. 197.

His Objections against the Doctrine of the *Decrees* in General, Examin'd, Ib. His Objections against their Doctrine of *Predestination* p. 201. Against their Doctrine of the *Efficacy* of *Grace* p. 207. shewed not to be inconsistent with a Good Life or unable to persuade one to Reform, in a

DIALOGUE BETWEEN a *CALVINIST* Teacher and a *DEBAUCHE* of the Party p. 209.

His Objections against the Doctrine of *Perseverance* p. 214.

SECT. II.

The *Presbyterian Articles* of Faith the same with those of the Christian *Church*. p. 221.

Proved that they are the Doctrine of the forreign *Reformed* Churches. Ib. Of the *Episcopalians* in *Scotland* p. 222. Of the Church of *England* p. 223. The Defences of some Modern *Divines* against this Imputation particularly consider'd p. 224. The *Calvinistick* Doctrines asserted to be the Doctrines of the Church of *England* 1*st* by the *English* Universities p. 226. 2*dly*, by the Supreme Ecclesiastical Governours of the Church p. 227. 3*dly*, by the *Court* p. 229. *Lastly*, by the *English* Delegates to forreign *Synods* Ib. Proved that the Doctrines objected against are the Doctrines of the Catholick Church p. 230.

Chap IV.

MR *Rhind's* Third Reason for *separating* from the *Presbyterians* viz. That their *Worship* is *fundamentally* Corrupt and Imperfect, Examin'd p. 233.

SECT. I.

His Objections against the *Presbyterian's Prayers* Examin'd. p. 234.

ART. *I.* His Argument and Ten Instances for Proving that the Matter of them must be and is *Corrupt* Examin'd. Ib.

ART. II. His Exceptions against the *Manner* of the *Presbyterian's Prayers* Examin'd, p. 248.

The alledged *Disadvantages of Extemporary Prayer* Consider'd. Ib. His Arguments for proving the *Excellency* of the *Liturgick* Way,

The Contents.

Way Examin'd. p. 251. His Argument for it from the *Nature of the Thing* Ib. *2dly* from *Universal Practice* p. 257. *3dly*, from Heaven's Approbation of it under the *Old and New Testament*. p. 259. *4thly*, from the Usage of it in the *Primitive* and *Ancient* Church p. 261. Lastly from the Practice of the *Reformed Churches*. p. 262.

Mr. *Rhind*'s Answer to the Objection against restricting People to *Forms* viz. *That they Stint the Spirit*, Considered p. 263. His horrid Comment on the *Spirit's Helping our Infirmities*. p. 264.

SECT. II.

The *Objections* against the *Presbyterian* Doctrine concerning the *Sacraments*, and *Exceptions* against their *Manner* of Dispensing them, Consider'd p. 272.

These Discoursed. 1st as to *Baptism*. Ib. *2dly*, as to the *Lord's Supper*. p. 279.

Some Remarks on the *Scots Episcopal Liturgy* p. 285.

Chap. V.

MR. *Rhind*'s Fourth Reason for *Separating* from the *Presbyterians* viz. *That their Spirit is Diametrically Opposite to that of the Gospel*, Examin'd. p. 289.

The Meaning and Intendment of this Reason. Ib. Several Things Charged on the *Presbyterians* which they not only Confess but avow. p. 291. Mr. *Rhind*'s Profaneness in Burlesquing the *Scripture* p. 292.

This Reason consider'd as to its Weight, and proved that tho' it were true, yet it alone would not Justify his *Separation* p. 295 His Reason Examin'd as to its *Truth*, p. 296. The *Presbyterian Spirit* not *Enthusiastical* p, 297. Not an *Animal* or *Mechanical Spirit* p. 301 Not a *Partial Damning Spirit* p. 303. Not a *Narrow* or *Mean Spirit* p. 304. Not a *Malicious* or *Unforgiving Spirit*, p. 306. Not an *Unconversible Spirit* p. 311. Not a *Disloyal* or *Rebellious Spirit* p. 313.

A Short *Digression* on the Right Honourable the Earl of *Cromerty's* Historical Account of the Conspiracies by the Earls of *Gowry* p. 317.

The *Presbyterian* Spirit not a *Spirit* of *Division* p. 330. Not an *Unneighbourly*, *Cruel* or *Barbarous Spirit*. p. 335.

The *CONCLUSION* p. 340.